

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 119 783

JC 760 176

AUTHOR Perelle, Ira B.
TITLE Study of the Division of Allied Health.
INSTITUTION New York City Community Coll., Brooklyn, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY Health Resources Administration (DHEW/PHS), Bethesda, Md.
PUB DATE Oct 75
NOTE 527p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-\$1.00 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; Employer Attitudes; *Followup Studies; Grades (Scholastic); *Graduate Surveys; *Health Occupations Centers; *Health Occupations Education; Institutional Research; *Junior Colleges; Learning Laboratories; Research Design; Student Attitudes; Student Certification; Student Characteristics; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *New York City Community College

ABSTRACT

This study examines student outcomes in the seven curriculum programs (chemical technology, dental hygiene, dental laboratory, medical laboratory, nursing, ophthalmic dispensing, and radiologic technology) of the Division of Allied Health and Natural Sciences at New York City Community College. The following variables are examined: student background, college grades, performance on certification and licensure examinations, student perceptions of the college experience, faculty perceptions of student development, employer perceptions of student performance, and student and faculty perceptions of the Allied Health Learning Center. These factors in single and combined form are used to evaluate student performance during three stages of the student's relationship with the College: pre-tenure, tenure, and post-tenure. Ten different questionnaires, sent to graduates, current students, faculty, and employers, and the official college records were used to compile the information in this report. Data are presented in 66 tables, and the questionnaires are appended. The research design provided in this investigation can be generalized to studies conducted by researchers in other institutions. (Author/NHM)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED 119783

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

NEW YORK CITY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Of the City University of New York

STUDY OF THE
DIVISION OF ALLIED HEALTH

Ira B. Perelle, Ph.D.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This project was initiated by the Dean of the Division of Allied Health and Natural Sciences and was implemented with the guidance of the Director of Educational and Institutional Research and with the cooperation of the Coordinator of the Allied Health Learning Center and the chairpersons and faculty of the division. It was supported by Grant No. 2 E04NU00904-03 (RF 2030), HRA, DHEW.

JR 760 176

The material in this publication was supported by a grant from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Points of view or opinions are those of the author and do not represent the official view or opinions of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Preface

During the formative years of the community college movement the priority of resources focused on growth. Educational energies were directed toward attempts to keep up with increasing numbers of students. New programs were launched, new facilities were located or constructed and governance structures were hastily planned to involve the community, the faculty and the students in making decisions.

Now, as community colleges approach the beginning of the 80's, they are experiencing the first effects of the "steady state." Concern is expressed less with the quantity and more with the quality of educational programs offered to students. Quality education, with its myriad of definitions, does not depend primarily on the numbers of students, or on the diversity of programs, or on new devices for decision making although these factors certainly contribute. The quality of education depends primarily on the quality of the instructional program. If the community college of the future is to realize even a modicum of its potential, faculty and administrators will have to begin to pay as much attention to the outputs of instructional programs as to the number of students, buildings, and organizational structures.

The purpose of this study was to examine student outcomes in the seven curriculum programs of the Division of Allied Health and Natural Sciences at New York City Community College. Outcome measures were defined in terms of their status as descriptors of student achievement and measured in accord with the following variables: student background, college achievement, student perceptions of the college experience, performance on certification

and licensure examinations, faculty perceptions of student development, employer perceptions of student performance, and faculty and student perceptions of an Allied Health Learning Center. These factors in single and combined form were used to evaluate student performance during three stages of their relationship with the college: pre-tenure, tenure, and post-tenure. A combination of research techniques were used at various stages in the investigation to collect data. They elicited a wealth of information concerning the nature and quality of student outputs, all of which is reported in the following pages.

Our indebtedness to many persons is very great. This study would not have come to fruition were it not for the cooperation of department chairpersons and faculty in the following programs:

<u>Program</u>	<u>Name</u>
Medical Laboratory (Biological Science)	Prof. M. Tolhoff
Pre-Pharmacy (Chemistry)	Prof. T. Alfieri
Dental Hygiene	Prof. L. Warren
Dental Lab Technology	Prof. Martinelli
Nursing	Prof. McGinnis
Ophthalmic Dispensing	Prof. Evans
Radiologic Technology	Prof. H. Wiig
Allied Health Learning Center	Prof. L. Beitler

Long hours and enormous amount of work were invested in the design and data collection stages of this investigation. We would like to acknowledge the efforts of Dr. Ira E. Perelle and members of his staff in the implementation, tabulation and interpretation of research data. Probably one of the most ambitious longitudinal studies of student outcomes ever undertaken in the community college, the research design provided in this investigation can be made

generalizeable to studies conducted by different researchers in
different institutions.

New York
October 1975

Richard L. Alfred

August Tuosto

Lorraine Beitler

ABSTRACT

Modification of the teaching process, whether it be in method, course content, evaluation, or any other aspect of the formal education structure, rarely is made as a result of a thorough, searching investigation of procedures currently used, and the utility of such procedures for achieving desired educational objectives. The Division of Allied Health and Sciences (the Division) of New York City Community College (N.Y.C.C.C.) has commenced a series of measures that may make it one of the rare educational institutions that do take significant but considered action as a result of the findings of a meticulous study.

This study, an evaluation of the graduates, their background, their perceptions of Division courses, their faculty, their employers, and the Allied Health Learning Center, provides a knowledge base from which to implement change to attain the sought objectives. In some departments, graduate performance on the pertinent licensing and/or certification examinations could be improved to allow them to become employed in their chosen discipline. The Allied Health Learning Center ^{was} established to provide an internal organization with a broad mandate to reduce deficits in basic learning skills related to science and career curricula in the various departments.

Several significant findings were discovered. It will be found in the Graduate Biographical section that more than 40% of graduates of the Chemical Technology, Dental Laboratory, and Medical Laboratory departments have left their respective disciplines for various reasons. The Graduate Perceptions section indicates a sizeable variation in perceived value and difficulty of course components between departments. Chemical Technology department graduates perceived lectures to be excellent learning experiences; Dental Laboratory department graduates perceived lectures to be less effective learning experiences. Faculty are aware that if they downgrade the level of course content in order to reduce the difficulty of the course, they will reduce the quality of education and thus do the student a disservice.

Sections 2 through 7 examine graduates' perceptions of their N.Y.C.C.C. courses, course components, instructors, and teaching strategies in relation to the various licensure/certification examinations. Wide variations in scores are shown to exist within all examinations. In all departments, some graduates required more than one attempt to pass the licensure/certification examination. These sections also provide the results of correlations computed between course

grades and licensure/certification examination scores.

The Faculty Analysis section is subdivided into three subsections providing an analysis of the faculty of the Division by department, an analysis of faculty perceptions of their department and students prior to open admissions and currently, and an analysis of instructional strategies and techniques. It will be found that faculty perceive virtually no change in their department between the period prior to open admissions and currently, but do perceive a sizeable difference between "regular" students and open admissions students. Faculty perceive a sizeable percentage of their students to be unprepared in basic skills. The Employer Perceptions section provides a limited analysis of perceived characteristics of N.Y.C.C.C. graduates as employees.

The Allied Health Learning Center (AHLC) section is subdivided into four subsections: an analysis of AHLC clients, both faculty and student, patterns of utilization of AHLC services by both faculty and students, perceived effectiveness of AHLC, and synthesis of open ended response. Among the findings in this section is the highly significant

difference in attendance at Freshman Skills Laboratory by students whose instructors explained services available at AHLC and students whose instructors did not explain AHLC services. It may also be seen in this section that AHLC appears to be understaffed to provide all tutorial services desired ^{to those} who use the service and many students were completely unaware of the services available at AHLC until requested to complete the questionnaire for this study.

Data for this evaluation was obtained from graduates, students, faculty and employers, as well as from official records of graduates. Information for the Graduate Biographical section and Graduate Perceptions section was provided by 595 graduate respondents to questionnaires mailed to 2700 Division graduates. Appropriate licensure/certification questionnaires were also mailed to graduates, with their responses providing part of the data for the licensure/certification sections. Approximately 100 telephone interviews were conducted with graduates who did not respond in writing, to verify the validity of the mail responses. No significant differences were found between mailed and telephone responses.

Data for the Faculty Analysis section and the faculty subsection of AHLC was obtained by questionnaires distributed directly to faculty. Approximately 50% return was received. Students provided information for the student subsections of AHLC section by responding to a questionnaire, as did employers for the Employer Perceptions section.

For convenience, all tables will be found at the end of each section of the study. Copies of all questionnaires will be found in the appendix.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Graduate Biographical Section	1- 27
Graduate Perceptions Section	28- 76
Dental Hygiene Section	77-119
Medical Laboratory Section	120-144
Nursing Section	145-169
Ophthalmic Dispensing Section	170-201
Radiologic Technology Section	202-235
Faculty Perceptions Section	236-296
Employer Perceptions Section	297-321
AHLC Section	322-410
Questionnaires	411-499

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table #</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
B-1	Graduate Respondents by Dept.	7
B-2	Graduate Respondents by Attendance Category	8
B-3	Graduate Respondents by Enrollment Pattern	9
B-4	Graduate Respondents by Age	10
B-5	Graduate Respondents by Starting Year	11
B-6	Graduate Respondents by Year of Graduation	12
B-7	Attendance Category of Respondents by Dept.	13
B-8	Age of Respondents by Dept.	14
B-9	Starting Year of Respondents by Dept.	15
B-10	Graduation Year of Respondents by Dept.	16
B-11	College Credit Transferred into N.Y.C.C.C. by Graduates, by Dept.	17
B-12	Prior Health Services Experience of Grads by Dept.	18
B-13	Aver. Hours Employed while a Student at N.Y.C.C.C. by Dept.	19
B-14	Status of Cont. Ed. since Graduating from N.Y.C.C.C. by Dept.	20
B-15	Degree Earned after Graduating from N.Y.C.C.C. by Dept.	21
B-16	Credits Transferred from N.Y.C.C.C. by Dept.	22
B-17	Current Employment Related to N.Y.C.C.C. Dept., by Dept.	23
B-18	Current Salary by Dept.	24
B-19	No. of Positions since Graduation by Dept.	25
B-20	Reasons for Non-Employment in N.Y.C.C.C. Dept. Related Field, by Dept.	26
B-21	Reasons for Changing from N.Y.C.C.C. Dept. Related Field to another Health Field, by Dept.	27

<u>Table #</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
GP-1	Grad. Perception of Gen. Education <u>Lectures</u> as a Learning Experience, by Dept.	40
GP-2	Grad. Perception of Gen. Educ. <u>Class Discussions</u> as a Learning Experience, by Dept.	41
GP-3	Grad. Perception of Gen. Educ. <u>Laboratories</u> as a Learning Experience, by Dept.	42
GP-4	Grad. Perception of Gen. Educ. <u>Reading Materials</u> as a Learning Experience, by Dept.	43
GP-5	Grad. Perception of Gen. Educ. <u>Written Assignments</u> as a Learning Experience, by Dept.	44
GP-6	Grad. Perception of Gen. Educ. <u>Teacher Comments</u> as a Learning Experience, by Dept.	45
GP-7	Grad. Perception of Gen. Educ. <u>Examinations</u> as a Learning Experience, by Dept.	46
GP-8	Grad. Perception of Career Learning <u>Lectures</u> as a Learning Experience, by Dept.	47
GP-9	Grad. Perception of Career Learning <u>Class Discussions</u> as a Learning Experience, by Dept.	48
GP-10	Grad. Perception of Career Learning <u>Laboratories</u> as a Learning Experience, by Dept.	49
GP-11	Grad. Perception of Career Learning <u>Reading Materials</u> as a Learning Experience, by Dept.	50
GP-12	Grad. Perception of Career Learning <u>Written Assignments</u> as a Learning Experience, by Dept.	51
GP-13	Grad. Perception of Career Learning <u>Teacher Comments</u> as a Learning Experience, by Dept.	52
GP-14	Grad. Perception of Career Learning <u>Examinations</u> as a Learning Experience, by Dept.	53
GP-15	Grad. Perception of Difficulty of Career Learning <u>Lectures</u> , by Dept.	54
GP-16	Grad. Perception of Difficulty of Career Learning <u>Class Discussions</u> , by Dept.	55
GP-17	Grad. Perception of Difficulty of Career Learning <u>Laboratories</u> , by Dept.	56
GP-18	Grad. Perception of Difficulty of Career Learning <u>Reading Materials</u> , by Dept.	57

<u>Table #</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
GP-19	Grad. Perception of Difficulty of Career Learning <u>Written Assignments</u> , by Dept.	58
GP-20	Grad. Perception of Difficulty of Career Learning <u>Examinations</u> , by Dept.	59
GP-21	Grad. Perception of Frequency of Cheating on Examinations, by Dept.	60
GP-22	Grad. Perception of Career Learning Instructors as Teachers, by Dept.	61
GP-23	Grad. Perception of Career Learning Instructors in Class, by Dept.	62
GP-24	Grad. Perception of Career Learning Instructors' Subj. Interest, by Dept.	63
GP-25	Grad. Perception of Career Learning Instructors' Stud. Interest, by Dept.	64
GP-26	Amount of Individual Help Sought from Instructors by Dept.	65
GP-27	Amount of Indiv. Help Rec'd from Instructors when Requested, by Dept.	66
GP-28	Amount of Indiv. Help Offered by Instructors, by Dept.	67
GP-29	Grad. Perception of Career Learning Instructors' Availability for Consultation, by Dept.	68
GP-30	Grad. Perception of Career Learning Instructors' Ease of Communication, by Dept.	69
GP-31	Grad. Perception of Career Learning Instructors' Help with Problems, by Dept.	70
GP-32	Grad. Perception of Career Learning Instructors' Help with Program Planning, by Dept.	71
GP-33	Grad. Perception of Career Learning Instructors' Accuracy of Info., by Dept.	72
GP-34	Frequency of Grad. Interviews with College Counselor during Enrollment, by Dept.	73
GP-35	Grad. Perception of Educ. Activities most Conducive to Satisfactory Completion of N.Y.C.C.C. Curriculum	74

<u>Table #</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
GP-36	Perceived Difference in Techniques taught at N.Y.C.C.C. vs. Tech. Used, by Dept.	75
GP-37	Grad. Perception of N.Y.C.C.C. Curriculum as Career Preparation, by Dept.	76
DC-1	Grad. Scores on NBDHL Examination	87
DC-2	Grad. Report of # of Attempts Needed to Pass NBDHL	88
DC-3	Year of Grad. Attempts at NBDHL	89
DC-4	Grad. Report of Other Examinations Attempted	90
DC-5	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Oral Inspection</u> Section of NBDHL	91-92
DC-6	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Radiographic</u> Section of NBDHL	93-94
DC-7	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Diagnostic Aids</u> Section of NBDHL	95-96
DC-8	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Prophylaxis A</u> Section of NBDHL	97-98
DC-9	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Prophylaxis B</u> Section of NBDHL	99-100
DC-10	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Topical Agents</u> Section of NBDHL	101-102
DC-11	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Oral Health Instr.</u> Section of NBDHL	103-104
DC-12	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Supportive Treatment</u> Section of NBDHL	105-106
DC-13	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Emergencies</u> Section of NBDHL	107-108
DC-14	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Community Health</u> Section of NBDHL	109-110
DC-15	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for Actual Employment Conditions	111-112
DC-16	Grad. Grades for Selected Career Learning Courses	113-114

<u>Table #</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
DC-17	Grad. Percep. of Course Components for Each Section of NBDHL	115
DC-18	Grad. Percep. of Career Learning Instructors' Help as Prep. for Each Section of NBDHL	116
DC-19	Grad. Percep. of Teaching Strategy as Best Prep. for Each Section of NBDHL	117
DC-20	Grad. Percep. of NYCCC Curriculum as Prep. for NBDHL	118
DC-21	Grad. Percep. of NYCCC Curriculum as Prep. for Each Section of NBDHL	119
MC-1	Grad. Scores on MLT/ASCP Certification Exam	127
MC-2	MLT/ASCP Certification Exam Year	128
MC-3	Grad. Report of Other Examinations Attempted	129
MC-4	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Microbiology</u> Section of MLT/ASCP	130
MC-5	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Serology</u> Section of MLT/ASCP	131
MC-6	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Clinical Chemistry</u> Section of MLT/ASCP	132
MC-7	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Hematology</u> Section of MLT/ASCP	133
MC-8	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Urinalysis</u> Section of MLT/ASCP	134
MC-9	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Blood Banking</u> Section of MLT/ASCP	135
MC-10	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Parasitology</u> Section of MLT/ASCP	136
MC-11	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for Actual Employment Conditions	137
MC-12	Grad. Grades for Selected Career Learning Courses	138-139
MC-13	Grad. Percep. of Course Component as Best Prep. for Each Section of MLT/ASCP	140

<u>Table #</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
MC-14	Grad. Percep. of Career Learning Instructors' Help as Prep. for Each Section of MLT/ASCP	141
MC-15	Grad. Percep. of Teaching Strategy as Best Prep. for Each Section of MLT/ASCP	142
MC-16	Grad. Percep. of NYCCC Curriculum as Prep. for MLT/ASCP	143
MC-17	Grad. Percep. of NYCCC Curriculum as Prep. for Each Section of MLT/ASCP	144
NC-1	Grad. Scores on Sections of NYSBLE	154
NC-2	Selected Statistics for Each Section of NYSBLE	155
NC-3	Grad. Report of # of Attempts Required to Pass NYSBLE	156
NC-4	NYSBLE Year by Attempt	157
NC-5	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Medical</u> Section of NYSBLE	158
NC-6	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Surgical</u> Section of NYSBLE	159
NC-7	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Obstetrics</u> Section of NYSBLE	160
NC-8	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Pediatrics</u> Section of NYSBLE	161
NC-9	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Psychiatry</u> Section of NYSBLE	162
NC-10	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for Actual Employment Conditions	163
NC-11	Grad. Grades for Selected Career Learning Courses	164
NC-12	Grad. Percep. of Course Component as Best Prep. for Each Section of NYSBLE	165
NC-13	Grad. Percep. of Career Learning Instructors' Help as Prep. for Each Section of NYSBLE	166
NC-14	Grad. Percep. of Teaching Strategy as Best Prep. for Each Section of NYSBLE	167

<u>Table #</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
NC-15	Grad. Percep. of NYCCC Curriculum as Prep. for NYSBLE	168
NC-16	Grad. Percep. of NYCCC Curriculum as Prep. for Each Section of NYSBLE	169
OC-1	Grad. Scores on Each Section of NYSBODL	180
OC-2	Selected Statistics Describing Sections of NYSBODL	181
OC-3	No. of Attempts Necessary for Grad. to Pass NYSBODL	182
OC-4	NYSBODL Year, by Attempt	183
OC-5	Grad. Attempt at Amer. Board of Opticianary Certification Examination	184
OC-6	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Theoretical Optics</u> Section of NYSBODL	185
OC-7	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Anatomy/Physiology</u> Section of NYSBODL	186
OC-8	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Ophthalmic Disp.</u> Section of NYSBODL	187
OC-9	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Ophthalmic Materials</u> Section of NYSBODL	188
OC-10	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Ophthalmic Optics</u> Section of NYSBODL	189
OC-11	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Practical Dispensing</u> Section of NYSBODL	190
OC-12	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Contact Lenses Written</u> Section of NYSBODL	191
OC-13	Grad. Percep. of Value of Spec. Courses as Prep. for <u>Contact Lenses Oral Procedures</u> Section of NYSBODL	192
OC-14	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Contact Lenses Fitting</u> Section of NYSBODL	193
OC-15	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Contact Lenses Practical</u> Section of NYSBODL	194
OC-16	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for Actual Employment Conditions	195

<u>Table #</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
OC-17	Grad. Grades for Selected Career Learning Courses	196
OC-18	Grad. Percep. of Course Component as Best Prep. for Each Section of NYSBODL	197
OC-19	Grad. Percep. of Career Learning Instructors' Help as Prep. for Each Section of NYSBODL	198
OC-20	Grad. Percep. of Teaching Strategy as Best Prep. for Each Section of NYSBODL	199
OC-21	Grad. Percep. of NYCCC Curriculum as Prep. for NYSBODL	200
OC-22	Grad. Percep. of NYCCC Curriculum as Prep. for Each Section of NYSBODL	201
RC-1	Grad. Scores on NYSL	210
RC-2	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Radiographic Techniques</u> Section of NYSL	211-212
RC-3	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Standard Positioning</u> Section of NYSL	213-214
RC-4	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Anatomy/Physiology</u> Section of NYSL	215-216
RC-5	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>X-Ray Physics</u> Section of NYSL	217-218
RC-6	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Radiation Therapy</u> Section of NYSL	219-220
RC-7	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Special Procedures</u> Section of NYSL	221-222
RC-8	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>General Physics</u> Section of NYSL	223-224
RC-9	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for <u>Therapy</u> Section of NYSL	225-226
RC-10	Grad. Percep. of Value of Specific Courses as Prep. for Actual Employment Conditions	227-228
RC-11	Grad. Grades for Selected Career Learning Courses	229-230

<u>Table #</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
RC-12	Grad. Percep. of Course Component as Best Prep. for Each Section of NYSL	231
RC-13	Grad. Percep. of Career Learning Instructors' Help as Prep. for Each Section of NYSL	232
RC-14	Grad. Percep. of Teaching Strategy as Best Prep. for Each Section of NYSL	233
RC-15	Grad. Percep. of NYCCC Curriculum as Prep. for NYSL	234
RC-16	Grad. Percep. of NYCCC Curriculum as Prep. for Each Section of NYSL	235
F-1	Faculty Respondents by Dept.	246
F-2	Faculty Position by Dept.	247
F-3	Faculty Rank by Dept.	248
F-4	Faculty Tenure by Dept.	249
F-5	Faculty Length of Service by Dept.	250
F-6	Faculty Prior Teaching Experience by Dept.	251
F-7	Faculty Percep. of Academic Quality of Dept. Prior to Open Admissions by Dept.	252
F-8	Faculty Percep. of Academic Quality of Dept. at This Time by Dept.	253
F-9	Faculty Percep. of Academic Quality of Students Prior to Open Admissions by Dept.	254
F-10	Faculty Percep. of Academic Quality of Current Regular Students by Dept.	255
F-11	Faculty Percep. of Academic Quality of Current Open Admissions Students by Dept.	256
F-12	Faculty Percep. of Percentage of Advanced Students without Necessary Knowledge or Skills	257
F-13	Faculty Percep. of AHD Grad. with Necessary Knowledge and Skill for Satis. Job Performance	258
F-14	Faculty Percep. of Importance of Passing Certification/Licensure Exam by Dept.	259

<u>Table #</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
F-15	Fac. Perceiving Influence of Stud. Evaluation on Selected Instruct. Components by Dept.	260
F-16	Fac. Perceiving Influence of Stud. Evaluation on Selected Instruct. Components by Tenure	261
F-17	Fac. Percep. of Occurrence of Cheating on Examinations, by Dept.	262
F-18	Relative Faculty Use of Lectures for General Course Material by Dept.	263
F-19	Relative Faculty Use of Lectures for Specific Certification Exam Material by Dept.	264
F-20	Relative Faculty Use of Seminars for General Course Material by Dept.	265
F-21	Relative Faculty Use of Seminars for Specific Certification Exam Material by Dept.	266
F-22	Relative Faculty Use of Laboratory for General Course Material by Dept.	267
F-23	Relative Faculty Use of Laboratory for Specific Certification Exam Material by Dept.	268
F-24	Relative Faculty Use of Individualized Instruction for General Course Material by Dept.	269
F-25	Relative Faculty Use of Individualized Instruction for Specific Certification Exam Material by Dept.	270
F-26	Relative Faculty Use of Evaluation and Testing for General Course Material by Dept.	271
F-27	Relative Faculty Use of Evaluation and Testing for Specific Certification Exam Material by Dept.	272
F-28	Relative Faculty Use of Advisement, Library Research and Admin. Func. for Gen. Course Material by Dept.	273
F-29	Relative Faculty Use of Advisement, Library Research and Admin. Func. for Spec. Cert. Exam Material	274
F-30	Relative Faculty Use of Lectures for General Course Material by Rank	275
F-31	Relative Faculty Use of Lectures for Specific Certification Exam Material by Rank	276
F-32	Relative Faculty Use of Seminars for General Course Material by Rank	277

<u>Table. #</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
F-33	Relative Faculty Use of Seminars for Specific Certification Exam Material by Rank	278
F-34	Relative Faculty Use of Laboratories for General Course Material by Rank	279
F-35	Relative Faculty Use of Laboratories for Specific Certification Exam Material by Rank	280
F-36	Relative Faculty Use of Individualized Instruc. for General Course Material by Rank	281
F-37	Relative Faculty Use of Indiv. Instruc. for Specific Certification Exam Material by Rank	282
F-38	Relative Faculty Use of Evaluation and Testing for General Course Material by Rank	283
F-39	Relative Faculty Use of Evaluation and Testing for Specific Certification Exam Material by Rank	284
F-40	Relative Fac. Use of Advisement, Libr. Research and Admin. Func. for General Course Material by Rank	285
F-41	Relative Fac. Use of Advisement, Libr. Research and Admin. Func. for Spec. Cert. Exam Material by Rank	286
F-42	Extensiveness of Use of Pass/Fail Examinations by Dept.	287
F-43	Extensiveness of Use of Curve Grading by Dept.	288
F-44	Extensiveness of Use of Behav. Objectives by Dept.	289
F-45	Extensiveness of Use of Indiv. Instr. by Dept.	290
F-46	Extensiveness of Use of Audio/Visual Media by Dept.	291
F-47	Extensiveness of Use of Pass/Fail Exams by Rank	292
F-48	Extensiveness of Use of Curve Grading by Rank	293
F-49	Extensiveness of Use of Behav. Objectives by Rank	294
F-50	Extensiveness of Use of Indiv. Instr. by Rank	295
F-51	Extensiveness of Use of Audio/Visual Media by Rank	296

<u>Table #</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
EP-1	No. of NYCCC Grad. Employed by Respondents, by Dept.	302
EP-2	No. of NYCCC Grad. Previously Employed by Respondents, by Dept.	303
EP-3	Employers' Percep. of # of NYCCC Grad. Superior to Aver. Entry Level Employee, by Dept.	304
EP-4	Employers' Percep. of # of NYCCC Grad. Inferior to Aver. Entry Level Employee, by Dept.	305
EP-5	Employers' Percep. of NYCCC Graduates' Employee Characteristics	306-307
EP-6	Employers' Percep. of <u>Chemical Technology</u> Grad. Employee Characteristics	308-309
EP-7	Employers' Percep. of <u>Dental Hygiene</u> Grad. Employee Characteristics	310-311
EP-8	Employers' Percep. of <u>Dental Laboratory</u> Grad. Employee Characteristics	312-313
EP-9	Employers' Percep. of <u>Medical Laboratory</u> Grad. Employee Characteristics	314-315
EP-10	Employers' Percep. of <u>Nursing</u> Grad. Employee Characteristics	316-317
EP-11	Employers' Percep. of <u>Ophthalmic Dispensing</u> Grad. Employee Characteristics	318-319
EP-12	Employers' Percep. of <u>Radiologic Technology</u> Grad. Employee Characteristics	320-321
1	Faculty Respondents by Dept.	344
2	Faculty Response by Position	345
3	Faculty Response by Rank	346
4	Faculty Response by Tenure	347
5	Faculty Position by Dept.	348
6	Faculty Rank by Dept.	349
7	Faculty Tenure by Dept.	350
8	Faculty Length of Service at N.Y.C.C.C. by Dept.	351

<u>Table #</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
9	Faculty Prior Teaching Experience by Dept.	352
10	Student Respondents by Dept.	353
11	Student Attendance Category by Dept.	354
12	Student Enrollment Pattern by Dept.	355
13	Student Expected Grad. Year by Dept.	356
14	Student Starting Year by Dept.	357
15	Student Age by Dept.	358
16	Student Credits Transferred In by Dept.	359
17	Students' Prior Exper. in Health Field by Dept.	360
18	Student Salaried Employment by Dept.	361
19	Faculty Use of AHLC Services by Dept.	362
20	Faculty Use of AHLC Services by Rank	363
21	Faculty Use of AHLC Services by Tenure	364
22	Faculty Use of AHLC Services by Length of Service	365
23	Faculty Recommendation of AHLC Serv. to Students with Acad. Problems by Dept.	366
24	Faculty Recommendation of AHLC Serv. to Students with Acad. Problems by Tenure	367
25	Faculty Recommendation of AHLC Serv. to Students with Acad. Problems by Rank	368
26	Faculty Recommendation of AHLC Serv. to Students with Acad. Problems by Length of Service	369
27	Faculty Use of Modular Instr. Devel. by Dept.	370
28	Faculty Use of Modular Instr. Devel. by Tenure	371
29	Faculty Use of Modular Instr. Devel. by Rank	372
30	Fac. Use of Mod. Instr. Devel. by Length of Service	373
31	Professional Contact Between Faculty and AHLC Personnel per Semester by Dept.	374

<u>Table #</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
32	Professional Contact Between Faculty and AHLC Personnel per Semester by Tenure	375
33	Professional Contact Between Faculty and AHLC Personnel per Semester by Rank	376
34	Professional Contact Between Faculty and AHLC Personnel per Semester by Length of Service	377
35	Faculty Awareness of AHLC Services by Dept.	378
36	Faculty Awareness of AHLC Services by Tenure	379
37	Faculty Awareness of AHLC Services by Rank	380
38	Fac. Awareness of AHLC Serv. by Length of Service	381
39	Explanation of AHLC Services from Instructors by Dept.	382
40	Recommendation of AHLC Services from Instructors by Dept.	383
41	Explanation of AHLC Services from Student Personnel Services Counselors by Dept.	384
42	Recommendation of AHLC Services from Student Personnel Services Counselors by Dept.	385
43	Explanation of AHLC Services from Departmental Acad. Advisors by Dept.	386
44	Recommendation of AHLC Services from Departmental Acad. Advisors by Dept.	387
45	Students Attending Freshman Learning Skills Laboratory by Dept.	388
46	Students Attending Effective Reading Program by Dept.	389
47	Students' Attendance of Effective Reading Program Sessions by Dept.	390
48	Students Attending Open Lab Program by Dept.	391
49	Students Use of Open Lab Facility by Dept.	392
50	Students Attending Certification Seminars by Dept.	393
51	Results of 2x2 Chi Square Procedures On Source of Information vs. Use of AHLC Services	394

<u>Table #</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
52	Perceived Effectiveness in Instr. Aid Prep.	395
53	Perceived Benefit of Instr. Aid Prep.	396
54	Perceived Effectiveness of AHLC Stud. Serv.	397-398
55	Perceived Effectiveness of AHLC Stud. Record Services	399
56	Perceived Effectiveness of AHLC A/V Equipment Services	400
57	Perceived Benefits of AHLC A/V Equipment Services	401
58	Perceived Effectiveness of AHLC Faculty Workshops	402
59	Perceived Effectiveness of AHLC Modular Instruction for Student Use	403
60	Perceived Value of AHLC to Students and Faculty of N.Y.C.C.C.	404
61	Student Perceived Effectiveness of Freshman Learning Skills Program	405
62	Student Perceived Effectiveness of Effective Reading Program	406
63	Student Perceived Effectiveness of Open Lab Program	407
64	Student Perceived Effectiveness of Certification Seminars	408
65	Student Perceived Responsiveness of AHLC	409
66	Student Perceived Effectiveness of AHLC by Dept.	410

INDEX TO QUESTIONNAIRES

	<u>Page</u>
Graduate Biography and Perceptions	412-418
Dental Hygiene Licensing	419-433
Medical Laboratory Certification	434-440
Nursing Licensing	441-447
Ophthalmic Dispensing Licensure	448-456
Radiologic Technology Licensure	457-469
Faculty Perceptions	470-474
Employer Perceptions	475-489
Allied Health Learning Center Evaluation Student Questionnaire	490-494
Allied Health Learning Center Evaluation Faculty Questionnaire	495-499

Graduate Biographical Section

Graduate Biographical Data

Graduates of the Allied Health and Natural Sciences Division of New York City Community College (N.Y.C.C.C.) were asked to respond to questionnaires eliciting information describing their N.Y.C.C.C. experiences, their post-graduate education if any, their Health Services career, their general perceptions of the various components of their college training, and their specific perceptions of their college training as it related to licensure/certification. This section describes and analyzes the graduates' prior and current biographical data.

Five hundred ninety-five responses were received from graduates of N.Y.C.C.C. Allied Health programs. An analysis of the graduates across departments is provided in Tables B-1 through B-6. It can be seen from Table B-1 that the greatest number of responses (271) were received from Nursing department graduates and the smallest number (9) received from Radiologic Technology department graduates. Table B-2 indicates that full-time-day student graduates provided 63.9% of the responses received, with part-time-evening student graduates providing the next highest proportion (19.5%).

The enrollment pattern of almost all respondents was continuous (93.9%) as shown in Table B-3. Data, therefore, will not be subdivided by enrollment pattern because non-continuous enrollment graduates are too few in number to provide meaningful results. Table B-4 provides a distribution of graduates by age. It can be seen that the age group containing the largest number of graduates is age 25-30 (37.8%). Approximately 25% of the responding graduates are younger than age 25, 19.7% age 30-40, and 16.5% over age 40.

Tables B-5 and B-6 provide data describing the starting year and graduation year for responding graduates. It can be seen that the greatest number of respondents started their training at N.Y.C.C.C. in 1968 (18.5%). The response follows a relatively normal distribution pattern to the tails, 1965 and 1972 (5.2% and 5.0% respectively). The year reported by the greatest number of respondents as their graduation year was 1973 (22.2%) with a skewed distribution tapering to 1968 (8.9%).

Attendance category, age, starting year, and graduation year were examined by department. The results are provided in Tables B-7 through B-10. It can be seen in Table B-7 that Dental Laboratory, Ophthalmic Dispensing, and Radiologic Technology Department graduates were Full-Time-Day students only. It may also be seen in Table B-7 that less than 50% of the Nursing Department graduates were Full-Time-Day students. Table B-8, providing Age data, shows that the youngest respondents tend to be

graduates of the Dental Hygiene Department; the oldest graduates tend to be graduates of the Nursing Department. Tables B-9 and B-10 show no significant trends except for a slight tendency for the graduates of 1968-1970 to be from the Medical Laboratory and Nursing Departments.

Approximately 10% of responding graduates transferred 3 or more college credits into N.Y.C.C.C. on entering, and approximately 40% of responding graduates had prior experience in the Health Services. This data is presented by Department in Tables B-11 and B-12. It can be seen in Table B-11 that the total percentages of students transferring college credit into N.Y.C.C.C. by Department tends to follow the percentages of respondents, by Department, with the exception of Radiologic Technology graduates who did not transfer any credits into N.Y.C.C.C. There are no significant trends relative to credit transfer among the departments. Table B-12 indicates that the majority of graduates with prior Health Service experience are Nursing Department graduates with prior experience as Licensed Practical Nurses (55.6%). The next sizeable category is Nursing Department graduates with prior experience as Aides (13.6%).

Employment during matriculation at N.Y.C.C.C. is presented in Table B-13. It can be seen in this table that approximately 75% of responding graduates were employed for a salary during their enrollment at N.Y.C.C.C. No significant trends are evident in the data.

Questions eliciting information describing the graduates' post-N.Y.C.C.C. education were included in the questionnaire. Data provided by the responses is presented in Tables B-14 through B-16. It can be seen in Table B-14 that of the 330 respondents (55.5%) attempting an advanced degree program, 92 respondents (15.5%) have completed their program and 189 respondents (31.8%) are still attending. Table B-15 provides information relative to the degrees earned, showing the B.S. degree as that earned most often. It can also be determined from Table B-15 that the Chemical Technology Department graduates report the largest percentage of respondents receiving degrees (43.5%) and the Ophthalmic Dispensing Department graduates report the smallest percentage of respondents receiving degrees (4.8%). Table B-16 shows that of the 303 graduates (50.9%) transferring credit from N.Y.C.C.C. to other schools, 255 (84.2%) transferred more than 50 credits.

Tables B-17 through B-19 describe the data relating to graduates' current employment, and Tables B-20 and B-21 provide information indicating reasons for current non-employment in the health field for which graduates were trained at N.Y.C.C.C. It can be noted in Table B-17 that almost 80% of all responding graduates are employed either full time or part time in the field for which they were trained at N.Y.C.C.C., but this figure is deceptive. Ninety-one percent of all Nursing Department graduates are currently employed in the nursing field, and, because nursing graduates represent 45% of all respondents they tend to skew the overall results. Table B-17 makes it clear that close to 50% of

Chemical Technology and Dental Laboratory Department graduates have left their respective fields as have almost 40% of Medical Laboratory Department graduates. The reasons stated by 124 graduates leaving their fields are analyzed in Table B-20 where it is shown that the largest number (46/35.4%) are continuing their education and the second significant group (26/20%) are married and/or raising children. Just three graduates, 0.5% of those responding, left their field because of non-certification.

Table B-18, providing data on current salary of graduates, indicates that the modal range is \$11,000.00 - \$13,000.00. The field indicating the highest mean salary is Radiologic Technology; the field indicating the lowest mean salary is Dental Laboratory Technology. Table B-19 states the employment mobility of N.Y.C.C.C. graduates by department. Approximately 41% of respondents have had only one position since graduation and only 23.5% have had more than two positions. Table B-21 shows reasons for changing employment to a health related field other than the one for which the respondent trained at N.Y.C.C.C., but the data represent only 27 responses, 4.5% of total responses, and must be used cautiously. The primary reason given for changing fields is to obtain more interesting employment.

Except for those described above, no significant trends related to any of the tabulated variables were detected. All cross tabulations provided proportions statistically similar to the sample proportions provided. No significant Chi Squares were obtained.

Table B-1

Graduate Respondents
by Department

	Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Number	62	119	23	90	271	21	9	595
% of total	10.4	20.0	3.9	15.1	45.5	3.5	1.5	100.0

Table B-2

Graduate Respondents by
Attendance Category

Respondents	Full Time Day	Part Time Day	Full Time Evening	Part Time Evening	No Response
Number	375	14	84	116	6
% of total	63.0	2.4	14.1	19.5	1.0

Table B-3

Graduate Respondents by
Enrollment Pattern

Respondents	Continuous	Non-continuous	No Response
Number	559	29	7
% of total	93.9	4.9	1.2



Table B-4

Graduate Respondents
by Age

Respondents	19	20	21	22	23	24	25-30	30-40	over 40	No Response
Number	1	14	19	27	43	45	225	117	98	6
% of total	0.2	2.4	3.2	4.5	7.2	7.6	37.8	19.7	16.5	1.0

Table B-5

Graduate Respondents
by Starting Year

Respondents	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	No Response
Number	31	66	95	110	99	65	80	30	19
% of total	5.2	11.1	16.0	18.5	16.6	10.9	13.4	5.0	3.2

Table B-6

Graduate Respondents by
Year of Graduation

Respondents	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	No Response
Number	53	69	75	85	98	132	73	1	9
% of total	8.9	11.6	12.6	14.3	16.5	22.2	12.3	0.2	1.5

Table B-7

Attendance Category of Respondents
by Department

Category		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Full time, Day	Number	52	91	23	57	122	21	9	375
	% of dept.	83.9	77.1	100.0	63.3	45.9	100.0	100.0	63.7*
Part time, Day	Number	2	5	0	1	6	0	0	14
	% of dept.	3.2	4.2	0.0	1.1	2.3	0.0	0.0	2.4
Full time, Evening	Number	0	12	0	13	59	0	0	84
	% of dept.	0.0	10.2	0.0	14.4	22.2	0.0	0.0	14.3
Part time, Evening	Number	8	10	0	19	79	0	0	116
	% of dept.	12.9	8.5	0.0	21.1	29.7	0.0	0.0	19.7

*Percent of total

Table B-8

Age of Respondents
by Department

Age		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
19	Number	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
20	Number	0	10	2	1	0	1	0	14
	% of dept.	0.0	8.5	8.7	1.1	0.0	4.8	0.0	2.4
21	Number	1	11	0	2	3	2	0	19
	% of dept.	1.6	9.3	0.0	2.2	1.1	9.5	0.0	3.2
22	Number	2	13	2	3	6	1	0	27
	% of dept.	3.3	11.0	8.7	3.3	2.2	4.8	0.0	4.6
23	Number	5	17	4	4	9	3	1	43
	% of dept.	8.2	14.4	17.4	4.4	3.4	14.3	11.1	7.3
24	Number	8	15	6	4	9	1	2	45
	% of dept.	13.1	12.7	26.1	4.4	3.4	4.8	22.2	7.6
25-30	Number	31	37	8	60	72	12	5	225
	% of dept.	50.8	31.4	34.8	66.7	27.0	57.1	55.6	38.2
30-40	Number	11	7	1	13	85	0	0	117
	% of dept.	18.0	5.9	4.3	14.4	31.8	0.0	0.0	19.9
over 40	Number	3	7	0	3	83	1	1	98
	% of dept.	4.9	5.9	0.0	3.3	31.1	4.8	11.1	16.6

Table B-9

Starting Year of Respondents
by Department

Year		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
1965	Number	8	2	0	9	12	0	0	31
	% of dept.	13.8	1.7	0.0	10.7	4.5	0.0	0.0	5.4
1966	Number	6	11	5	20	24	0	0	66
	% of dept.	10.3	9.5	21.7	23.8	9.0	0.0	0.0	11.5
1967	Number	12	16	0	18	45	2	2	95
	% of dept.	20.7	13.8	0.0	21.4	16.9	10.0	22.2	16.5
1968	Number	5	14	5	15	66	2	3	110
	% of dept.	8.6	12.1	21.7	17.9	24.8	10.0	33.3	19.1
1969	Number	11	22	3	5	56	1	1	99
	% of dept.	19.0	19.0	13.0	6.0	21.1	5.0	11.1	17.2
1970	Number	6	14	5	5	27	5	3	65
	% of dept.	10.3	12.1	21.7	6.0	10.2	25.0	33.3	11.3
1971	Number	9	21	3	10	32	5	0	80
	% of dept.	15.5	18.1	13.0	11.9	12.0	25.0	0.0	13.9
1972	Number	1	16	2	2	4	5	0	30
	% of dept.	1.7	13.8	8.7	2.4	1.5	25.0	0.0	5.2

Table B-10

Graduation Year of Respondents
by Department

Year		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
1968	Number	8	12	4	18	11	0	0	53
	% of dept.	13.3	10.2	17.4	20.7	4.1	0.0	0.0	9.0
1969	Number	6	14	1	17	27	2	2	69
	% of dept.	10.0	11.9	4.3	19.5	10.0	10.0	22.2	11.8
1970	Number	9	9	5	12	36	1	3	75
	% of dept.	15.0	7.6	21.7	13.8	13.4	5.0	33.3	12.8
1971	Number	13	14	3	10	43	2	0	85
	% of dept.	21.7	11.9	13.0	11.5	16.0	10.0	0.0	14.5
1972	Number	11	19	4	4	53	5	2	98
	% of dept.	18.3	16.1	17.4	4.6	19.7	25.0	22.2	16.7
1973	Number	12	25	4	16	69	4	2	132
	% of dept.	20.0	21.2	17.4	18.4	25.7	20.0	22.2	22.5
1974	Number	1	25	2	9	30	6	0	73
	% of dept.	1.7	21.2	8.7	10.3	11.2	30.0	0.0	12.5
1975	Number	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2

Table B-11

College Credit Transferred into N.Y.C.C.C.
by Graduates, by Department

Credits Transferred		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Optalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
3-5	Number	1	0	1	0	5	2	0	9
	%*	16.7	0.0	100.0	0.0	17.9	40.0	0.0	15.0**
6-10	Number	1	5	0	2	9	1	0	18
	%	16.7	41.7	0.0	25.0	32.1	20.0	0.0	30.0
11-15	Number	0	7	0	1	6	0	0	14
	%	0.0	58.3	0.0	12.5	21.4	0.0	0.0	23.3
16-20	Number	2	0	0	1	3	0	0	6
	%	33.3	0.0	0.0	12.5	10.7	0.0	0.0	10.0
21-25	Number	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	4
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	3.6	0.0	0.0	6.7
26-35	Number	1	0	0	0	4	1	0	6
	%	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	20.0	0.0	10.0
36-50	Number	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
	%	16.7	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3
51-75	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
76-100	Number	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	

*Percentage of department transferring credits
**Percentage of total transferring credits

Table B-12

Prior Health Services Experience
of Graduates by Department

Experience		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Aide	Number	1	11	0	5	33	0	1	51
	%*	8.3	73.3	0.0	20.0	18.0	0.0	50.0	20.9**
LPN	Number	0	0	0	1	135	0	0	136
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	73.8	0.0	0.0	55.9
Technician	Number	8	4	3	15	8	3	0	41
	%	66.7	26.7	100.0	60.0	4.4	100.0	0.0	16.9
Orderly	Number	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	50.0	0.8
Corpsman	Number	3	0	0	4	6	0	0	13
	%	25.0	0.0	0.0	16.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	5.3

* Percentage of Department with prior experience

** Percentage of total with prior experience

Table B-13

Average Hours Employed while a
Student at N.Y.C.C.C. by Department

Hours		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
1-10	Number	12	26	4	12	20	5	0	79
	% of dept.	25.5	29.9	26.7	19.7	9.6	29.4	0.0	17.9
11-20	Number	17	34	5	17	54	7	2	136
	% of dept.	36.2	39.1	33.3	27.9	25.8	41.5	33.3	30.8
21-30	Number	6	10	6	6	28	3	1	60
	% of dept.	12.8	11.5	40.0	9.8	13.4	17.6	16.7	13.6
31-40	Number	9	15	0	21	98	1	3	147
	% of dept.	19.1	17.2	0.0	34.4	46.9	5.9	50.0	33.3
over 40	Number	3	2	0	5	9	1	0	20
	% of dept.	6.4	2.3	0.0	8.2	4.3	5.9	0.0	4.5

Table B-14

Status of Continuing Education since
Graduating from N.Y.C.C.C. by Department

Status		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radio logic Technology	Total
Attending, Full time	Number	11	7	2	11	41	4	0	76
	% of dept.	23.4	18.4	16.7	17.5	26.3	40.0	0.0	23.0*
Attended Full time, Completed	Number	16	7	3	16	30	0	3	75
	% of dept.	34.0	18.4	25.0	25.4	19.2	0.0	75.0	22.7
Attended Full time, Withdrew	Number	3	1	4	5	4	1	1	19
	% of dept.	6.4	2.6	33.3	7.9	2.6	10.0	25.0	5.8
Attending Part time	Number	10	17	3	20	61	2	0	113
	% of dept.	21.3	44.7	25.0	31.7	39.1	20.0	0.0	34.2
Attended Part time, Completed	Number	4	1	0	5	7	0	0	17
	% of dept.	8.5	2.6	0.0	7.9	4.5	0.0	0.0	5.2
Attended Part time, Withdrew	Number	3	5	0	6	13	3	0	30
	% of dept.	6.4	13.2	0.0	9.5	8.3	30.0	0.0	9.1

* Percent of total

Table B-15

Degree Earned After Graduating
from N.Y.C.C.C. by Department

Degree		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
B.A.	Number	1	2	3	3	7	0	0	16
	% of dept.	3.7	14.3	60.0	10.3	14.6	0.0	0.0	12.6*
B.S.	Number	24	9	2	21	34	1	3	94
	% of dept.	88.9	64.3	40.0	72.4	70.8	100.0	100.0	74.0
M.A.	Number	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.8
M.S.	Number	2	3	0	5	5	0	0	15
	% of dept.	7.4	21.4	0.0	17.2	10.4	0.0	0.0	11.8
M.D., Ph.D.	Number	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.8

*Percent of total

Table B-16

Credits Transferred from N.Y.C.C.C.
by Department

Credits		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
1-10	Number	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
	% of dept.	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	0.7*
11-20	Number	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4
	% of dept.	0.0	6.3	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
21-30	Number	1	3	2	1	4	1	0	12
	% of dept.	2.1	9.4	20.0	1.7	2.8	14.3	0.0	4.0
31-40	Number	0	2	0	2	10	2	0	16
	% of dept.	0.0	6.3	0.0	3.3	6.9	28.6	0.0	5.3
41-50	Number	5	1	0	3	5	0	0	14
	% of dept.	10.6	3.1	0.0	5.0	3.5	0.0	0.0	4.6
Over 50	Number	41	23	6	54	125	3	3	255
	% of dept.	87.2	71.9	60.0	90.0	86.8	42.9	100.0	84.2

*Percent of total

Table B-17

Current Employment Related to N.Y.C.C.C.
Department, by Department

Related Employment		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Yes, Full time	Number	30	66	11	46	215	17	8	393
	% of dept.	48.4	55.5	47.8	51.1	79.3	80.9	8.9	66.1
Yes, Part time	Number	3	28	1	10	33	2	1	78
	% of dept.	4.8	23.5	4.4	11.1	12.2	9.5	1.1	13.1
No	Number	29	25	11	34	23	2	0	124
	% of dept.	46.7	21.0	47.8	37.8	8.5	9.5	0.0	20.8

* Percent of total

Table B-18

Current Salary
by Department

Salary (Dollars)		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Less than 5,000	Number	1	8	4	9	10	1	0	33
	% of dept.	2.1	8.2	20.0	12.3	3.9	5.9	0.0	6.3*
5,000- 7,000	Number	1	13	1	7	14	1	0	37
	% of dept.	2.1	13.3	5.0	9.6	5.5	5.9	0.0	7.1
7,001- 9,000	Number	10	18	10	8	7	0	0	53
	% of dept.	20.8	18.4	50.0	11.0	2.7	0.0	0.0	10.2
9,001- 11,000	Number	12	40	2	20	24	3	1	102
	% of dept.	25.0	40.8	10.0	27.4	9.4	17.6	11.1	19.6
11,001- 13,000	Number	14	12	0	8	102	6	3	145
	% of dept.	29.2	12.2	0.0	11.0	39.8	35.3	33.3	27.8
13,001- 15,000	Number	6	5	2	14	71	3	2	103
	% of dept.	12.5	5.1	10.0	19.2	27.7	17.6	22.2	19.8
15,001- 17,000	Number	1	2	0	4	22	1	3	33
	% of dept.	2.1	2.0	0.0	5.5	8.6	5.9	33.3	6.3
Over 17,000	Number	3	0	1	3	6	2	0	15
	% of dept.	6.3	0.0	5.0	4.1	2.3	11.8	0.0	2.9

*Percent of total

Table B-19

Number of Positions since
Graduation by Department

Positions	Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
1 Number	23	34	7	26	90	5	3	197
% of dept.	44.2	34.7	36.8	36.6	46.9	35.7	37.5	41.6
2 Number	16	28	6	27	78	6	4	165
% of dept.	30.8	28.6	31.6	38.0	37.0	42.9	50.0	34.9
3 Number	9	26	2	15	17	3	1	73
% of dept.	17.3	26.5	10.5	21.1	8.1	21.4	12.5	15.4
4 Number	2	6	2	2	11	0	0	23
% of dept.	3.8	6.1	10.5	2.8	5.2	0.0	0.0	4.9
5 Number	1	1	2	1	5	0	0	10
% of dept.	1.9	1.0	10.5	1.4	2.4	0.0	0.0	2.1
More Number than	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	5
5 % of dept.	1.9	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.1

Table B-20

Reasons for Non-employment in N.Y.C.C.C.
Department Related Field, by Department

Reasons		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Continuing Education	Number	15	2	2	12	12	3	0	46
	% of dept.	51.7	8.0	18.2	38.7	40.0	75.0	0.0	35.4
Inadequate Salary	Number	4	0	2	2	0	0	0	8
	% of dept.	13.8	0.0	18.2	6.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.2
Married and/or Raising Children	Number	0	12	1	8	5	0	0	26
	% of dept.	0.0	48.0	9.1	25.8	16.7	0.0	0.0	20.0
Health	Number	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	5
	% of dept.	0.0	12.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	3.8
Loss of Interest	Number	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	5
	% of dept.	3.4	4.0	27.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8
No Positions Available	Number	5	2	3	7	3	0	0	20
	% of dept.	17.2	8.0	27.3	22.6	10.0	0.0	0.0	15.4
Not Certified	Number	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
	% of dept.	0.0	12.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3
Other	Number	4	2	0	2	8	1	0	17
	% of dept.	13.8	8.0	0.0	6.5	26.7	25.0	0.0	13.1

Table B-21

Reasons for Changing from N.Y.C.C.C.
Department Related Field to Another
Health Field, by Department

Reasons		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Better Salary	Number	2	0	2	2	1	1	0	8
	% of dept.	20.0	0.0	40.0	33.3	25.0	100.0	0.0	29.6
More Op- portunity for Advance- ment	Number	4	0	1	1	1	0	0	7
	% of dept.	40.0	0.0	20.0	16.7	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.9
More Positions Available	Number	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	% of dept.	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.4
More Interesting Employment	Number	2	1	2	3	2	0	0	10
	% of dept.	20.0	100.0	40.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	37.0

Graduate Perception Section

This section of the Evaluation of the Allied Health Division of New York City Community College analyzes the perceptions, of graduates of the Division, of their courses, their former instructors, and their curriculum. Graduates were asked to rate components of their courses in terms of career preparation difficulty and value as a learning experience, and were asked to rate their instructors in terms of ability, interest, assistance provided, etc.

The result of graduate perception analysis is subdivided by department and is presented in three subsections:

Course Perceptions

Instructor Perceptions

Curriculum Perceptions.

All results are provided in the appendix to this section.

Course Perceptions

Graduates were asked to rate components of their General Education courses as learning experiences. The components rated were:

Lectures

Class Discussions

Laboratories

Reading Materials

Written Assignments

Teacher Comments

Examinations.

The results of these ratings by Department, can be found in Tables GP 1 through GP 7. The overall results were fairly consistent for the seven categories; 7%-15% perceived the various components as excellent learning experiences, 20%-35% as very good learning experiences, 35%-50% as good learning experiences, 8%-21% as fair learning experiences, and 1%-4% as poor learning experiences.

There were considerable variations by department. Chemical Technology graduates perceived lectures, laboratories, and reading materials to be excellent learning experiences at a greater rate than other department graduates and did not perceive these same components to be poor in any instance. Dental Laboratory graduates did not perceive lectures or written assignments to be excellent learning experiences at all, and did perceive lectures, class discussions, written assignments, and reading materials to be poor learning experiences at a greater rate than other departments.

Very few respondents (10: 2-Dental Hygiene; 6-Nursing) perceived examinations to be poor learning experiences, but a greater proportion of respondents perceived them to be fair learning experiences than any other component. Ophthalmic Dispensing graduates tended to rate components higher than graduates of any other department.

Graduates were asked to rate their perceptions of the same components of their Career Learning courses as learning experiences. The results of their ratings are presented in Tables GP 8 through GP 14. It can be seen in these tables that the range of graduates' perceptions in each category is at considerable variance from the ranges perceived in general education courses. The range of percentage of graduates perceiving components as excellent learning experiences was 7% to 15% for general education courses and was 10% to 25% for Career Learning courses. The range of percentage of graduates perceiving Career Learning components as very good learning experiences was 25% to 35%; as good: 28% to 41%; as fair: 6% to 20%; as poor: 0.5% to 2.8%.

Overall, the highest percentage of graduates perceived Career Learning lectures and laboratories as excellent learning experiences, and the lowest percentage of graduates perceived Career Learning written assignments and examinations as excellent learning experiences. The highest percentage of graduates perceived career learning laboratories and written assignments as poor learning experiences and the lowest percentage of graduates perceived lectures and examinations as poor learning experiences.

By department, Chemical Technology and Ophthalmic Dispensing graduates had a higher perception of the quality of most components than other department graduates although for the laboratory component 50% of the Dental Laboratory graduates perceive an excellent rating. The lowest quality rating for most components was perceived by Dental Laboratory graduates.

Graduates rated their perceptions of the difficulty of the various components (excluding Teacher Comments) of their Career Learning courses. These perceptions are given in Tables GP 15 through GP 20. It can be observed that the percentage of graduates whose perception of difficulty of the various components is extremely difficult or very difficult ranges from 0.3% to 5.5%. The majority of graduates perceived most components as not difficult with the exception of Career Learning laboratories and examinations, which were perceived as somewhat difficult. Classroom discussions was perceived as the easiest component by approximately 25% of the responding graduates.

When analyzed by department, Chemical Technology graduates, appear to rate the highest perceived difficulty in all components except Laboratory. A higher percentage of Ophthalmic Dispensing graduates tend to perceive the various components as easy than do graduates of other departments.

Graduates of the division were asked their perception of the frequency of cheating on examinations. This data is presented in Table GP 21. It can be seen that, almost 50% of the graduates perceived cheating on examinations as rare, while 19% perceived cheating as occurring often,

very often, or always. By department, Dental Hygiene graduates perceived cheating to a significantly greater level than any other department ($P < .04$).

When compared with faculty perceptions of cheating on examinations (see Table F-17, Faculty Perception Section), the graduate perceptions appear more widely dispersed. Faculty reporting perceptions greater than "sometimes" was 3.3%; graduates 17.6%. Faculty reporting perceptions of "sometimes" was 58.1%; graduates 32.9%. Faculty reporting perceptions less than "sometimes" was 35.5%; graduates 47.5%. Graduates generally perceived a greater amount of cheating than did faculty. As indicated above, Dental Hygiene graduates perceived significantly more cheating than did other departments. Similarly, Dental Hygiene faculty perceived more cheating than did faculty of other departments.

Instructor Perceptions

Graduates were asked to provide their perceptions of their former Career Learning instructors as teachers, in the classroom, as to their subject, and as to their students. These perceptions are shown in Tables GP 22 through GP 25. The data shown in Table GP 22 indicates that approximately 75% of the graduates responding perceived their Career Learning instructors as being interesting or very interesting, and 19% perceiving them as inspirational. Less than 5% perceived their instructors as being uninteresting or dull. Graduates of the Ophthalmic Dispensing department had the highest perception of their instructors: 80% found them inspirational or very interesting. Graduates of the Radiologic Technology department had the lowest perception of their instructors; with graduates of Dental Hygiene a very close second: 12.5% and 12.2% respectively perceived their instructors uninteresting.

Table GP 23 gives the perceptions of graduates of their former Career Learning instructors' classroom preparation. The majority of graduates (55.8%) perceived their instructors to be well-prepared in class, 32.8% perceived them to be very well-prepared, and 11.2% perceived them to be moderately prepared. By department, 100% of Ophthalmic Dispensing graduates perceived their instructors to be very well-prepared or well-prepared, the highest perception. The lowest perception of classroom preparation was by graduates of Radiologic Technology and Dental Hygiene; 33.3% and 22.4% of responding graduates respectively perceived their instructors to be moderately prepared.

Graduates' perception of the interest of their Career Learning instructors in their subject is shown in Table GP 24. It can be seen that 56.7% of graduates perceived their former instructors to be interested, 31.8% perceived their former instructors to be enthusiastic, and 11.1% perceived some interest. By department, 100% of Ophthalmic Dispensing graduates perceived enthusiastic or interested instructors, while 96% of Chemical Technology graduates perceived similar subject interest. Dental Hygiene and Radiologic Technology graduates perceived the least subject interest in their former instructors.

Table GP 25 analyzes graduates' perceptions of their former instructors' interest in students. Forty-five percent perceived their instructors to be concerned, 28.5% perceived their instructors to have some concern for their students, and 24.5% perceived their instructors to be very concerned. Graduates of Ophthalmic Dispensing department perceived the greatest concern in their instructors: 70% perceived instructors to be very concerned. Dental Hygiene and Chemical Technology graduates perceived least concern in their former instructors.

The amount of individual assistance sought from, received from, and offered by former instructors can be seen in Tables GP 26, GP 27, and GP 28. Most graduates (72.6%) requested individual help seldom or a few times, while 17.7% requested help often or very often, and 9.6% never requested individual help. Of those requesting individual help, 69% received the help they requested often or very often, 21.9% reported

receiving requested help a few times, and 9.2% reported seldom or never. Ophthalmic Dispensing graduates reported requesting and receiving the greatest amount of individual help. Dental Hygiene graduates requested the least individual help: 48.7% reported seldom or never requesting assistance; they also reported receiving the least individual help: 16.7% reported seldom or never receiving assistance when needed.

The amount of individual help offered by instructors without being requested is tabulated in Table GP 28. Thirty-four percent of reporting graduates perceived instructors as offering help often, 22.1% reported a few times, 21.7% reported very often, 15.0% reported seldom, and 6.7% reported never. The greatest amount of individual help offered, by department, was reported by Radiologic Technology graduates: 87.5% responded very often and often. The least perceived offered individual help was by graduates of Dental Hygiene department: 35.0% reported individual help was offered seldom or never.

Tables GP 29 through GP 33 provide graduates' perceptions of their Career Learning instructors on non-teaching functions. The functions specified are:

- Availability for consultation
- Ease of communication
- Help with problems
- Help with program planning
- Accuracy of information.

It can be seen in these tables that the correlation perceived between non-teaching tasks is relatively high. The most common response to this section was usually, chosen by 35% to 51% of respondents. The range of percentage was 31% to 36% for always, 10% to 20% for sometimes, 1.6% to 6.6% for seldom and 0.4% to 3.8% for never.

The non-teaching category receiving the highest percentage of positive responses was Accuracy of information: 87.3% selected always or usually; 2.4% selected seldom or never. The non-teaching category receiving the lowest percentage of positive responses was Help with program planning: 69% selected always or usually; 10.4% selected seldom or never. As is apparent in prior analysis, Ophthalmic Dispensing graduates rated their former instructors highest: 95% to 100% selected always or usually for all non-teaching functions. Dental Hygiene graduates rated their former instructors lowest: 4.4% to 17.4% selected seldom or never for all non-teaching functions.

Data indicating the frequency of college counselor interviews by graduates of the division is presented in Table GP 34. It is apparent that 62.7% of the responding graduates did not see a college counselor at all during their enrollment at N.Y.C.C.C. Of the 37.3% who did report interviews with a college counselor 62.2% reported 1 or 2 visits, 28.9% reported 3 to 5 visits, and 9.1% reported more than 5 visits. With the exception of **Radiologic Technology** graduates, graduates of all departments reported similar visit percentages. Radiologic Technology graduate percentages are distorted by the extremely small number reporting.

Curriculum Perceptions

Graduates were questioned as to the activity most conducive to satisfactory completion of their Career Learning curriculum at N.Y.C.C.C. The results are shown in Table GP 35. It can be seen in this table that 41.9% of responding graduates perceive high school to be the most significant factor in satisfactory curriculum completion, although there is considerable variation by department. 77.4% of Chemical Technology department graduates perceive high school to be the primary factor but only 16.0% of Medical Laboratory graduates perceive this to be true. Conversely 49.4% of Medical Laboratory graduates perceive the Biology Audio-tutorial laboratory to be the most important single factor in satisfactory curriculum completion but 0.0% of Chemical Technology graduates perceive this. The percentages shown for most other departments are not significantly different from the total percentages.

Graduates' perception of differences in techniques taught at N.Y.C.C.C. and those used in actual practice are shown in Table GP 36. It can be seen that 79.6% perceive no difference in techniques taught and used, with little variation among departments. The single exception is Medical Technology graduates: 41.7% perceive a difference between taught and used methods to exist.

Table GP 37 presents the graduates' perception of N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum as career preparation. Approximately 90% perceive the curriculum as good, very good, or excellent. The two departments whose graduates

perceive the highest ratings are Medical Laboratory and Chemical Technology. Eighty-three percent and 79% respectively perceived the curriculum as excellent or very good; 2.3% and 3.3% respectively perceived the curriculum as fair or poor. The two departments whose graduates perceive the lowest ratings are Dental Laboratory and Nursing: 22.7% and 16.1% respectively of their graduates perceive the curriculum to be fair or poor.

It is apparent from the perceptions discussed in this section that a very large percentage of responding graduates perceive their experience and training at N.Y.C.C.C. to have been very good. Most graduates perceive their general education courses to have been beneficial and an even greater percentage perceive the various components of their Career Learning courses to have been very helpful. Most graduates perceive their instructors to have been competent in class and helpful in non-teaching functions and almost all graduates perceive the entire N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum as having prepared them properly for their Health Service Career.

Table GP 1

Graduate perception of general education
lectures as a learning experience, by
department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Excellent	Number	11	7	0	17	43	1	1	80
	% of dept.	18.6	6.1	0.0	19.1	16.3	4.8	11.1	13.8*
Very Good	Number	26	32	7	38	88	12	3	206
	% of dept.	44.1	27.8	30.4	42.7	33.3	57.1	33.3	35.5
Good	Number	19	52	10	28	114	6	3	232
	% of dept.	32.2	45.2	43.5	31.5	43.2	28.6	33.3	40.0
Fair	Number	3	17	6	4	15	0	2	47
	% of dept.	5.1	14.8	26.1	4.5	5.7	0.0	22.2	8.1
Poor	Number	0	4	0	1	2	0	0	7
	% of dept.	0.0	3.5	0.0	1.1	0.8	0.0	0.0	1.2
Not Applicable	Number	0	3	0	1	2	2	0	8
	% of dept.	0.0	2.6	0.0	1.1	0.8	9.5	0.0	1.2

*Percent of total

Table GP 2

Graduate perception of general learning
class discussions as a learning experience,
by department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Excellent	Number	8	10	1	4	19	2	1	45
	% of dept.	13.8	8.6	4.3	4.6	7.1	9.5	11.1	7.8*
Very Good	Number	13	15	6	32	72	8	2	148
	% of dept.	22.4	12.9	26.1	36.8	27.1	38.1	22.2	25.5
Good	Number	24	58	9	31	116	7	4	249
	% of dept.	41.4	50.0	39.1	35.6	43.6	33.3	44.4	42.9
Fair	Number	9	25	6	17	44	2	1	104
	% of dept.	15.5	21.6	26.1	19.5	16.5	9.5	11.1	17.9
Poor	Number	3	7	1	2	9	0	1	23
	% of dept.	5.2	6.0	4.3	2.3	3.4	0.0	11.1	4.0
Not Applicable	Number	1	1	0	1	6	2	0	11
	% of dept.	1.7	0.9	0.0	1.1	2.3	9.5	0.0	1.9

*Percent of total

Table GP 3

Graduate perception of general education,
laboratories as a learning experience,
by department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Excellent	Number	23	11	7	22	22	2	1	88
	% of dept.	38.3	9.6	30.4	24.7	8.2	9.5	11.1	15.1*
Very Good	Number	17	21	2	28	72	7	2	149
	% of dept.	28.3	18.3	8.7	31.5	27.0	33.3	22.2	25.5
Good	Number	12	48	7	25	108	5	4	209
	% of dept.	20.0	41.7	30.4	28.1	40.4	23.8	44.4	35.8
Fair	Number	3	17	5	6	53	5	2	91
	% of dept.	5.0	14.8	21.7	6.7	19.9	23.8	22.2	15.6
Poor	Number	0	4	1	1	4	1	0	11
	% of dept.	0.0	3.5	4.3	1.1	1.5	4.8	0.0	1.9
Not Applicable	Number	5	14	1	7	8	1	0	36
	% of dept.	8.3	12.2	4.3	7.9	3.0	4.8	0.0	6.2

* Percent of total

Table GP 4

Graduate perception of general education
reading materials as a learning experience,
by department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Excellent	Number	9	5	1	16	46	2	0	79
	% of dept.	15.3	4.3	4.3	18.6	17.2	9.5	0.0	13.6*
Very Good	Number	13	27	4	21	70	4	5	144
	% of dept.	22.0	23.5	17.4	24.4	26.2	19.0	55.6	24.8
Good	Number	25	58	12	37	123	11	3	269
	% of dept.	42.4	50.4	52.2	43.0	46.1	52.4	33.3	46.4
Fair	Number	10	20	3	12	24	2	1	72
	% of dept.	16.9	17.4	13.0	14.0	9.0	9.5	11.1	12.4
Poor	Number	0	4	3	0	2	1	0	10
	% of dept.	0.0	3.5	13.0	0.0	0.7	4.8	0.0	1.7
Not Applicable	Number	2	1	0	0	2	1	0	6
	% of dept.	3.4	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.7	4.8	0.0	1.0

* Percent of total

Table GP 5

Graduate perception of general education
written assignments as a learning experience,
by department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Excellent	Number	4	4	0	5	27	1	0	41
	% of dept.	6.7	3.5	0.0	5.6	10.2	5.0	0.0	7.1*
Very Good	Number	16	12	5	18	61	4	4	120
	% of dept.	26.7	10.4	21.7	20.2	23.0	20.0	44.4	20.7
Good	Number	28	55	10	47	137	6	3	286
	% of dept.	46.7	47.8	43.5	52.8	51.7	30.0	33.3	49.2
Fair	Number	11	34	4	16	34	6	2	107
	% of dept.	18.3	29.6	17.4	18.0	12.8	30.0	22.2	18.4
Poor	Number	1	6	3	1	4	2	0	17
	% of dept.	1.7	5.2	13.0	1.1	1.5	10.0	0.0	2.9
Not Applicable	Number	0	4	1	2	2	1	0	10
	% of dept.	0.0	3.5	4.3	2.2	0.8	5.0	0.0	1.7

* Percent of total

Table GP 6

Graduate perception of general education
teacher comments as a learning experience,
 by department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Optalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Excellent	Number	5	7	4	14	26	4	2	62
	% of dept.	8.5	6.1	17.4	15.7	9.8	19.0	22.2	10.6*
Very Good	Number	18	20	5	21	61	5	1	131
	% of dept.	30.5	17.4	21.7	23.6	23.0	23.8	11.1	22.5
Good	Number	24	47	7	39	116	8	3	244
	% of dept.	40.7	40.9	30.4	43.8	43.8	38.1	33.3	42.0
Fair	Number	9	32	6	9	52	2	2	112
	% of dept.	15.3	27.8	26.1	10.1	19.6	9.5	22.2	19.3
Poor	Number	2	6	1	4	4	0	1	18
	% of dept.	3.4	5.2	4.3	4.5	1.5	0.0	11.1	3.1
Not Applicable	Number	1	3	0	2	6	2	0	14
	% of dept.	1.7	2.6	0.0	2.2	2.3	9.5	0.0	2.4

* Percent of total

Table GP 7

Graduate perception of general education examinations as a learning experience, by department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Optthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Excellent	Number	5	4	1	10	21	2	1	44
	% of dept.	8.3	3.4	4.3	11.2	8.0	9.5	11.1	7.6*
Very Good	Number	12	17	4	26	64	5	5	133
	% of dept.	20.0	14.7	17.4	29.2	24.2	23.8	55.6	22.9
Good	Number	31	57	9	39	117	10	1	264
	% of dept.	51.7	49.1	39.1	43.8	44.3	47.8	11.1	45.4
Fair	Number	12	34	9	13	54	3	2	127
	% of dept.	20.0	29.3	39.1	14.6	20.5	14.3	22.2	21.8
Poor	Number	0	2	0	0	6	0	0	8
	% of dept.	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	1.4
Not Applicable	Number	0	2	0	1	2	1	0	6
	% of dept.	0.0	1.7	0.0	1.1	0.8	4.8	0.0	1.0

*Percent of total

Table GP 8

Graduate perception of Career Learning
lectures as a learning experience,
by department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Optometric Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Excellent	Number	21	24	2	31	57	9	0	144
	% of dept.	35.0	20.7	10.0	35.2	22.4	42.9	0.0	25.3*
Very Good	Number	26	35	7	34	87	9	5	203
	% of dept.	43.3	30.2	35.0	38.6	34.1	42.9	55.6	35.7
Good	Number	11	41	5	19	97	2	3	178
	% of dept.	18.3	35.3	25.0	21.6	38.0	9.5	33.3	31.3
Fair	Number	2	14	6	4	10	0	1	37
	% of dept.	3.3	12.1	30.0	4.5	3.9	0.0	11.1	6.5
Poor	Number	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	3
	% of dept.	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.5
Not Applicable	Number	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	4
	% of dept.	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.8	4.8	0.0	0.7

* Percent of total

Table GP 9

Graduate perception of Career Learning
class discussions as a learning
experience, by department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Excellent	Number	10	18	4	18	25	8	1	84
	% of dept.	16.9	15.5	20.0	20.7	9.8	38.1	12.5	14.8*
Very Good	Number	26	25	4	29	83	9	3	179
	% of dept.	44.1	21.6	20.0	33.3	32.4	42.9	37.5	31.6
Good	Number	15	46	7	23	100	1	3	195
	% of dept.	25.4	39.7	35.0	26.4	39.1	4.8	37.5	34.4
Fair	Number	5	19	4	14	36	2	1	81
	% of dept.	8.5	16.4	20.0	16.1	14.1	9.5	12.5	14.3
Poor	Number	2	4	1	1	7	0	0	15
	% of dept.	3.4	3.4	5.0	1.1	2.7	0.0	0.0	2.6
Not Applicable	Number	1	4	0	2	5	1	0	13
	% of dept.	1.7	3.4	0.0	2.3	2.0	4.8	0.0	2.3

* Percent of total

Table GP 10

Graduate perception of Career Learning
laboratories as a learning experience,
by department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Optthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Excellent	Number	29	29	10	26	35	5	1	135
	% of dept.	48.3	24.8	50.0	29.5	13.6	23.8	11.1	23.6*
Very Good	Number	21	27	2	33	75	7	2	167
	% of dept.	35.0	23.1	10.0	37.5	29.2	33.3	22.2	29.2
Good	Number	7	34	3	20	87	7	4	162
	% of dept.	11.7	29.1	15.0	22.7	33.9	33.3	44.4	28.3
Fair	Number	2	22	4	8	45	1	2	84
	% of dept.	3.3	18.8	20.0	9.1	17.5	4.8	22.2	14.7
Poor	Number	1	5	1	0	12	0	0	19
	% of dept.	1.7	4.3	5.0	0.0	4.7	0.0	0.0	3.3
Not Applicable	Number	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	5
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	1.2	4.8	0.0	0.9

*Percent of total

Table GP 11

Graduate perception of Career Learning
reading materials as a learning experience,
by department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Excellent	Number	12	19	4	24	53	4	0	116
	% of dept.	20.3	16.2	20.0	28.4	20.4	19.0	0.0	20.3*
Very Good	Number	21	31	7	18	83	5	5	170
	% of dept.	35.6	36.5	35.0	21.2	31.9	23.8	55.6	29.8
Good	Number	16	46	4	37	101	7	3	214
	% of dept.	27.1	39.3	20.0	43.5	38.8	33.3	33.3	37.5
Fair	Number	7	18	3	5	18	2	1	54
	% of dept.	11.9	15.4	15.0	5.9	6.9	9.5	11.1	9.5
Poor	Number	1	3	2	1	3	2	0	12
	% of dept.	1.7	2.6	10.0	1.2	1.2	9.5	0.0	2.1
Not Applicable	Number	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	5
	% of dept.	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	4.8	0.0	0.9

* Percent of total

Table GP 12

Graduate perception of Career Learning
written assignments as a learning
experience, by department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Excellent	Number	12	9	2	10	21	2	0	56
	% of dept.	20.0	7.8	10.5	11.8	8.1	10.0	0.0	9.9*
Very Good	Number	18	12	3	24	80	3	4	144
	% of dept.	30.0	10.3	15.8	28.2	31.0	15.0	44.4	25.4
Good	Number	20	59	5	36	106	8	3	237
	% of dept.	33.3	50.9	26.3	42.4	41.1	40.0	33.3	41.8
Fair	Number	8	28	6	12	42	1	2	99
	% of dept.	13.3	24.1	31.6	14.1	16.3	5.0	22.2	17.5
Poor	Number	1	5	3	0	5	2	0	16
	% of dept.	1.7	4.3	15.8	0.0	1.9	10.0	0.0	2.8
Not Applicable	Number	1	3	0	3	4	4	0	15
	% of dept.	1.7	2.6	0.0	3.5	1.6	20.0	0.0	2.6

*Percent of total

Table GP 13

Graduate perception of Career Learning
teacher comments as a learning experience,
 by department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Excellent	Number	14	20	5	23	35	9	2	108
	% of dept.	24.1	17.2	25.0	26.4	13.5	42.9	22.2	18.9*
Very Good	Number	17	26	5	24	74	8	2	156
	% of dept.	29.3	22.4	25.0	27.6	28.6	38.1	22.2	27.4
Good	Number	23	40	4	32	99	2	3	203
	% of dept.	39.7	34.5	20.0	36.8	38.2	9.5	33.3	35.6
Fair	Number	2	23	6	6	43	1	2	83
	% of dept.	3.4	19.8	30.0	6.9	16.6	4.8	22.2	14.6
Poor	Number	1	6	0	0	3	0	0	10
	% of dept.	1.7	5.2	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	1.8
Not Applicable	Number	1	1	0	2	5	1	0	10
	% of dept.	1.7	0.9	0.0	2.3	1.9	4.8	0.0	1.8

*Percent of total

Table GP 14

Graduate perception of Career Learning
examinations as a learning experience,
by department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Excellent	Number	12	8	3	16	22	4	1	66
	% of dept.	20.0	6.9	15.0	18.6	8.6	19.0	11.1	11.6*
Very Good	Number	20	22	2	28	75	8	6	161
	% of dept.	33.3	19.0	10.0	32.6	29.2	38.1	66.7	28.3
Good	Number	17	48	8	33	107	5	0	218
	% of dept.	28.3	41.8	40.0	38.4	41.6	23.8	0.0	38.3
Fair	Number	11	37	6	9	44	3	2	112
	% of dept.	18.3	31.9	30.0	10.5	17.1	14.3	22.2	19.7
Poor	Number	0	0	1	0	7	0	0	8
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.0	1.4
Not Applicable	Number	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	4
	% of dept.	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.8	4.8	0.0	0.7

* Percent of total

Table GP 15

Graduate perception of difficulty of
Career Learning lectures, by department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Extremely Difficult	Number	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	5
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	4.8	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.9*
Very Difficult	Number	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	5
	% of dept.	1.7	1.7	0.0	1.1	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.9
Somewhat Difficult	Number	23	24	0	27	40	4	2	120
	% of dept.	38.3	20.7	0.0	30.7	15.3	20.0	22.2	20.9
Not Difficult	Number	27	74	14	42	165	8	7	337
	% of dept.	45.0	63.8	66.7	47.7	63.2	40.0	77.8	58.6
Easy	Number	9	14	6	15	46	7	0	97
	% of dept.	15.0	12.1	28.6	17.0	17.6	35.0	0.0	16.9
Not Applicable	Number	0	2	0	2	6	1	0	11
	% of dept.	0.0	1.7	0.0	2.3	2.3	5.0	0.0	1.9

* Percent of total

Table GP 16

Graduate perception of difficulty of
Career Learning class discussions,
by department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Optalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Extremely Difficult	Number	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	4.8	1.1	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.5*
Very Difficult	Number	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	5
	% of dept.	5.2	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.9
Somewhat Difficult	Number	12	6	0	12	26	1	1	58
	% of dept.	20.7	5.2	0.0	13.6	9.9	5.0	11.1	10.1
Not Difficult	Number	27	71	13	46	164	8	7	336
	% of dept.	46.6	61.2	61.9	52.3	62.4	40.0	77.8	58.4
Easy	Number	13	31	7	21	59	10	0	141
	% of dept.	22.4	26.7	33.3	23.9	22.4	50.0	0.0	24.5
Not Applicable	Number	3	7	0	8	12	1	1	32
	% of dept.	5.2	6.0	0.0	9.1	4.6	5.0	1.1	5.6

*Percent of total

Table GP 17

Graduate perception of difficulty of
Career Learning laboratories, by
department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Extremely Difficult	Number	0	1	0	0	5	0	0	6
	% of dept.	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	1.0*
Very Difficult	Number	2	4	0	0	12	0	0	18
	% of dept.	3.3	3.4	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	3.1
Somewhat Difficult	Number	22	57	7	32	111	5	2	236
	% of dept.	36.1	48.7	33.3	36.8	42.0	25.0	22.2	40.8
Not Difficult	Number	23	41	7	41	98	6	4	220
	% of dept.	37.7	35.0	33.3	47.1	37.1	30.0	44.4	38.0
Easy	Number	13	13	6	14	33	8	3	90
	% of dept.	21.3	11.1	28.6	16.1	12.5	40.0	33.3	15.5
Not Applicable	Number	1	1	1	0	5	1	0	9
	% of dept.	1.6	0.9	4.8	0.0	1.9	0.5	0.0	1.6

* Percent of total

Table GP 18

Graduate perception of difficulty of
Career Learning reading materials,
by department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Extremely Difficult	Number	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3
	% of dept.	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.5*
Very Difficult	Number	0	4	0	0	1	1	0	6
	% of dept.	0.0	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.4	5.0	0.0	1.0
Somewhat Difficult	Number	22	24	2	27	44	7	3	129
	% of dept.	36.1	20.9	9.5	31.0	16.7	35.0	33.3	22.4
Not Difficult	Number	30	73	11	48	170	8	3	343
	% of dept.	49.2	63.5	52.4	55.2	64.6	40.0	33.3	59.5
Easy	Number	6	12	8	11	40	3	2	82
	% of dept.	9.8	10.4	38.1	12.6	15.2	15.0	22.2	14.2
Not Applicable	Number	2	2	0	1	6	1	1	13
	% of dept.	3.3	1.7	0.0	1.1	2.3	5.0	11.1	2.3

* Percent of total

Table GP 19

Graduate perception of difficulty of
Career Learning written assignments,
by department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Extremely Difficult	Number	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.3*
Very Difficult	Number	0	2	0	3	7	0	1	13
	% of dept.	0.0	1.7	0.0	3.4	2.6	0.0	11.1	2.2
Somewhat Difficult	Number	27	28	2	16	82	3	0	158
	% of dept.	44.3	23.9	9.5	18.4	30.9	15.8	0.0	27.3
Not Difficult	Number	30	72	12	50	142	9	5	320
	% of dept.	49.2	61.5	57.1	57.5	53.6	47.4	55.6	55.3
Easy	Number	3	12	5	12	25	3	2	62
	% of dept.	4.9	10.3	23.8	13.8	9.4	15.8	22.2	10.7
Not Applicable	Number	1	3	2	6	7	4	1	24
	% of dept.	1.6	2.6	9.5	6.9	2.6	21.1	11.1	4.1

* Percent of total

Table GP 20

Graduate perception of difficulty of
Career Learning examinations, by
department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Extremely Difficult	Number	0	1	0	0	3	0	1	5
	% of dept.	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	11.1	0.9*
Very Difficult	Number	3	9	0	8	12	0	0	32
	% of dept.	5.0	7.7	0.0	9.1	4.6	0.0	0.0	5.5
Somewhat Difficult	Number	36	63	6	46	134	5	3	293
	% of dept.	60.0	53.8	28.6	52.3	51.1	25.0	33.3	50.8
Not Difficult	Number	16	37	11	28	100	11	4	207
	% of dept.	26.7	31.6	52.4	31.8	38.2	55.0	44.4	35.9
Easy	Number	4	5	4	6	9	3	0	31
	% of dept.	6.7	4.3	19.0	6.8	3.4	15.0	0.0	5.4
Not Applicable	Number	1	2	0	0	4	1	1	9
	% of dept.	1.7	1.7	0.0	0.0	1.5	5.0	11.1	1.6

* Percent of total

Table GP 21

Graduate perception of frequency of cheating on examinations by department

Frequency		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Always	Number	0	7	1	3	9	1	1	22
	% of dept.	0.0	7.1	7.7	4.5	5.1	5.6	14.3	5.3*
Very Often	Number	1	13	0	0	8	1	0	23
	% of dept.	2.6	13.1	0.0	0.0	4.5	5.6	0.0	5.5
Often	Number	1	12	1	3	16	3	1	37
	% of dept.	2.6	12.1	7.7	4.5	9.0	16.7	14.3	8.8
Sometimes	Number	15	34	3	21	56	8	1	138
	% of dept.	39.5	34.3	23.1	31.8	31.5	44.4	14.3	32.9
Rarely	Number	21	33	8	39	89	5	4	199
	% of dept.	55.3	33.3	61.5	59.1	50.0	27.8	57.1	47.5

* Percent of total

Table GP 22

Graduate perception of Career Learning
instructors as teachers, by department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Inspirational	Number	8	17	2	25	54	3	0	109
	% of dept.	13.3	14.8	8.7	29.1	21.0	14.3	0.0	19.1
Very Interesting	Number	26	21	6	36	66	14	1	170
	% of dept.	43.3	18.3	26.1	41.9	25.7	66.7	12.5	29.8
Interesting	Number	25	63	14	24	128	4	6	264
	% of dept.	41.7	54.8	60.9	27.9	49.8	19.0	75.0	46.3
Uninteresting	Number	0	14	1	0	8	0	1	24
	% of dept.	0.0	12.2	4.3	0.0	3.1	0.0	12.5	4.2
Dull	Number	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	3
	% of dept.	1.7	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.5

Table GP 23

Graduate perception of Career Learning
instructors in class, by department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Very well Prepared	Number	15	31	7	39	81	12	3	188
	% of dept.	25.0	26.7	30.4	44.3	31.6	57.1	33.3	32.8
Well Prepared	Number	39	59	13	45	152	9	3	320
	% of dept.	65.0	50.9	56.5	51.1	59.4	42.9	33.3	55.8
Moderately Prepared	Number	6	26	3	4	22	0	3	64
	% of dept.	10.0	22.4	13.0	4.5	8.6	0.0	33.3	11.2
Unpre- pared	Number	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.2

Table GP 24

Graduate perception of Career Learning
instructors' subject interest, by
department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Optalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Enthusi- astic	Number	19	34	8	41	66	12	1	181
	% of dept.	31.7	29.3	34.8	47.1	26.0	57.1	11.1	31.8
Interested	Number	39	55	13	41	160	9	6	323
	% of dept.	65.0	47.4	56.5	47.1	63.0	42.9	66.7	56.7
Some Interest	Number	2	26	2	5	26	0	2	63
	% of dept.	3.3	22.4	8.7	5.7	10.2	0.0	22.2	11.1
Not Interested	Number	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.2
Negative	Number	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
	% of dept.	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.4

Table GP 25

Graduate perception of Career Learning
instructors' student interest, by
department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Very Concerned	Number	12	21	4	25	56	14	2	134
	% of dept.	21.1	18.8	20.0	29.1	22.9	70.0	25.0	24.5
Concerned	Number	31	52	10	38	109	4	5	249
	% of dept.	54.4	46.4	50.0	44.2	44.5	20.0	62.5	45.4
Some Concern	Number	12	34	6	22	79	2	1	156
	% of dept.	21.1	30.4	30.0	25.6	32.2	10.0	12.5	28.5
Uncon- cerned	Number	2	4	0	1	1	0	0	8
	% of dept.	3.5	3.6	0.0	1.2	0.4	0.0	0.0	1.5
Antagon- istic	Number	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2

Table GP 26

Amount of individual help sought
from instructors, by department

Frequency		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Very Often	Number	1	3	2	6	12	0	1	25
	% of dept.	1.8	2.6	10.0	6.8	4.6	0.0	12.5	4.4*
Often	Number	9	7	4	18	30	7	1	76
	% of dept.	15.8	6.0	20.0	20.5	11.5	35.0	12.5	13.3
Few Times	Number	21	50	10	35	102	10	3	231
	% of dept.	36.8	42.7	50.0	39.8	39.2	50.0	37.5	40.5
Seldom	Number	20	40	4	26	89	2	2	183
	% of dept.	35.1	34.2	20.0	29.5	34.2	10.0	25.0	32.1
Never	Number	6	17	0	3	27	1	1	55
	% of dept.	10.5	14.5	0.0	3.4	10.4	5.0	12.5	9.6

* Percent of total

Table GP 27

Amount of individual help received
from instructors when requested,
by department

Frequency		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Very Often	Number	22	32	7	32	61	12	2	168
	% of dept.	37.9	29.6	35.0	37.2	25.0	60.0	25.0	30.9*
Often	Number	23	36	6	31	100	7	4	207
	% of dept.	39.7	33.3	30.0	36.0	41.0	35.0	50.0	38.1
Few Times	Number	9	22	6	18	63	0	1	119
	% of dept.	15.5	20.4	30.0	20.9	25.8	0.0	12.5	21.9
Seldom	Number	4	11	1	4	15	0	0	35
	% of dept.	6.9	10.2	5.0	4.7	6.1	0.0	0.0	6.4
Never	Number	0	7	0	1	5	1	1	15
	% of dept.	0.0	6.5	0.0	1.2	2.0	5.0	12.5	2.8

* Percent of total

Table GP 28

Amount of individual help offered
by instructors, by department

Frequency		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Very Often	Number	17	15	3	23	50	8	4	120
	% of dept.	30.4	13.2	15.0	26.4	20.1	44.4	50.0	21.7*
Often	Number	17	36	7	29	92	6	3	190
	% of dept.	30.4	31.6	35.0	33.3	36.9	33.3	37.5	34.4
Few Times	Number	15	23	7	21	53	2	1	122
	% of dept.	26.8	20.2	35.0	24.1	21.3	11.1	12.5	22.1
Seldom	Number	5	29	3	8	36	2	0	83
	% of dept.	8.9	25.4	15.0	9.2	14.5	11.1	0.0	15.0
Never	Number	2	11	0	6	18	0	0	37
	% of dept.	3.6	9.6	0.0	6.9	7.2	0.0	0.0	6.7

*Percent of total

Table GP 29

Graduate perception of Career Learning
instructors' availability for consultation
by department

Frequency		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Always	Number	17	24	7	27	88	10	2	175
	% of dept.	29.8	20.7	36.8	30.7	34.8	50.0	25.0	31.2*
Usually	Number	30	52	9	43	113	10	5	262
	% of dept.	52.6	44.8	47.4	48.9	44.7	50.0	62.5	46.7
Sometimes	Number	8	34	3	17	47	0	1	110
	% of dept.	14.0	29.3	15.8	19.3	18.6	0.0	12.5	19.6
Seldom	Number	1	3	0	1	4	0	0	9
	% of dept.	1.8	2.6	0.0	1.1	1.6	0.0	0.0	1.6
Never	Number	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	5
	% of dept.	1.8	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.9

*Percent of total

Table GP 30

Graduate perception of Career Learning
instructors' ease of communication,
by department

Frequency		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radio logic Technology	Total
Always	Number	17	22	6	37	77	14	3	176
	% of dept.	29.8	18.8	31.6	42.0	30.4	70.0	37.5	31.3*
Usually	Number	26	51	8	32	114	5	3	239
	% of dept.	45.6	43.6	42.1	36.4	45.1	25.0	37.5	42.5
Sometimes	Number	14	36	5	17	56	1	1	130
	% of dept.	24.6	30.8	26.3	19.3	22.1	5.0	12.5	23.1
Seldom	Number	0	6	0	1	5	0	0	12
	% of dept.	0.0	5.1	0.0	1.1	2.0	0.0	0.0	2.1
Never	Number	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	5
	% of dept.	0.0	1.7	0.0	1.1	0.4	0.0	12.5	0.9

*Percent of total

Table GP 31

Graduate perception of Career Learning
instructors' help with problems, by
department

Frequency		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Always	Number	24	19	6	35	72	14	2	172
	% of dept.	41.4	16.5	31.6	39.8	29.3	70.0	25.0	31.0*
Usually	Number	26	50	9	35	112	6	3	241
	% of dept.	44.8	43.5	47.4	39.8	45.5	30.0	37.5	43.5
Sometimes	Number	7	30	4	17	53	0	2	113
	% of dept.	12.1	26.1	21.1	19.3	21.5	0.0	25.0	20.4
Seldom	Number	1	12	0	1	8	0	1	23
	% of dept.	1.7	10.4	0.0	1.1	3.3	0.0	12.5	4.2
Never	Number	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	5
	% of dept.	0.0	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.9

*Percent of total

Table GP 32

Graduate perception of Career Learning
instructors' help with program planning,
by department

Frequency		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Optalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Always	Number	24	24	8	34	81	13	3	187
	% of dept.	42.1	21.1	44.4	38.6	33.2	68.4	37.5	34.1*
Usually	Number	18	39	3	30	93	5	3	191
	% of dept.	31.6	34.2	16.7	34.1	38.1	26.3	37.5	34.9
Sometimes	Number	11	30	5	18	48	0	1	113
	% of dept.	19.3	26.3	27.8	20.5	19.7	0.0	12.5	20.6
Seldom	Number	2	13	1	5	13	1	1	36
	% of dept.	3.5	11.4	5.6	5.7	5.3	5.3	12.5	6.6
Never	Number	2	8	1	1	9	0	0	21
	% of dept.	3.5	7.0	5.6	1.1	3.7	0.0	0.0	3.8

*Percent of total

Table GP 33

Graduate perception of Career Learning
instructors' accuracy of information,
by department

Frequency		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Always	Number	24	28	9	38	87	11	2	199
	% of dept.	42.1	24.6	47.4	43.7	34.4	55.0	25.0	35.7*
Usually	Number	30	63	9	43	128	9	6	288
	% of dept.	52.6	55.3	47.4	49.4	50.6	45.0	75.0	51.6
Sometimes	Number	3	18	1	5	31	0	0	58
	% of dept.	5.3	15.8	5.3	5.7	12.3	0.0	0.0	10.4
Seldom	Number	0	4	0	1	6	0	0	11
	% of dept.	0.0	3.5	0.0	1.1	2.4	0.0	0.0	2.0
Never	Number	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
	% of dept.	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.4

* Percent of total

Table GP 34

Frequency of graduate interviews
with college counselor during
enrollment, by department

Frequency (times)		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
1-2	Number	15	20	5	26	70	2	0	138
	% of dept.	65.2	62.5	55.6	65.0	63.1	66.7	0.0	62.2*
3-5	Number	3	11	3	10	33	1	3	64
	% of dept.	13.0	37.4	33.3	25.0	29.7	33.3	75.0	28.9
6-13	Number	3	0	0	1	7	0	0	11
	% of dept.	13.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	6.3	0.0	0.0	5.0
11-15	Number	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	5
	% of dept.	4.3	0.0	11.1	7.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3
over 15	Number	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	4
	% of dept.	4.3	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	25.0	1.8

*Percent of total

Table GP 35

Graduate perception of educational activities most conducive to satisfactory completion of N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum

Activity		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
High School	Number	41	45	8	13	99	10	2	218
	% of dept.	77.4	46.4	36.4	16.0	40.9	58.8	25.0	41.9
Biology Audio- Tutorial Lab.	Number	0	7	2	40	18	1	1	69
	% of dept.	0.0	7.2	9.1	49.4	7.4	5.9	12.5	13.3
AHLC Student Services	Number	2	15	3	7	57	2	1	87
	% of dept.	3.8	15.5	13.6	8.6	23.6	11.8	12.5	16.7
Develop- mental Skills Program	Number	2	8	2	4	18	2	1	37
	% of dept.	3.8	8.2	9.1	4.9	7.4	11.8	12.5	7.1
Other	Number	8	22	7	17	50	2	3	109
	% of dept.	15.1	22.7	31.8	21.0	20.7	11.8	37.5	21.0

Table GP 36

Perceived difference in techniques
taught at N.Y.C.C.C. vs. techniques
used, by department

Difference		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Yes	Number	8	18	2	30	43	3	1	105
	% of dept.	19.0	17.3	14.3	41.7	16.8	15.8	12.5	20.4
No	Number	34	86	12	42	213	16	7	410
	% of dept.	81.0	82.7	85.7	58.3	83.2	84.2	87.5	79.6

Table GP 37

Graduate perception of N.Y.C.C.C.
curriculum as career preparation,
by department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Excellent	Number	26	19	6	33	33	6	0	123
	% of dept.	42.6	16.4	27.3	37.9	12.3	28.6	0.0	21.1
Very Good	Number	22	46	3	39	100	10	6	266
	% of dept.	36.1	39.7	13.6	44.8	37.3	47.6	66.7	38.7
Good	Number	11	41	8	13	92	5	2	172
	% of dept.	18.0	35.3	36.4	14.9	34.3	23.8	22.2	29.5
Fair	Number	2	10	4	2	38	0	1	57
	% of dept.	3.3	8.6	18.2	2.3	14.2	0.0	11.1	9.8
Poor	Number	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	6
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	1.0

Dental Hygiene Licensure Section

To evaluate the success of graduates of the Dental Hygiene department of New York City Community College (N.Y.C.C.C.) on the National Board Dental Hygiene Licensing (NBDHL) examination, and to determine their perception of the value of various components of their N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum as preparation for the NBDHL examination, this section of the division evaluation was prepared. One-hundred-nineteen Dental Hygiene department graduates responded to this questionnaire mailed to all graduates; 99 respondents (83.2%) indicated they attempted the NBDHL examination. The data herein is representative of these respondents.

As stated above, 99 graduates reported taking the NBDHL examination. Table DC-1 provides data describing the actual scores obtained by graduates of N.Y.C.C.C. who reported taking the NBDHL examination and 7 graduates of N.Y.C.C.C. who did not report taking the examination. Table DC-1 also provides selected statistics derived from the NBDHL scores reported. It can be seen in Table DC-1 that approximately 76% of Dental Hygiene department graduates attempting NBDHL examination scored 71 or over. The range of graduates' scores appears rather high (83) with a high score of 93 and a low score of 10. Approximately 7% of the graduates attempting the examination scored 40 or below.

Tables DC-2 and DC-3 provide data showing the number of attempts necessary to pass the NBDHL examination and the years in which the first and second attempt were made. It is evident from Table DC-2 that 95% of Dental Hygiene department graduates reporting passed the NBDHL examination in their first or second attempt; 2% did not pass at all. Table DC-3 shows 1974 to be the peak examination year for responding graduates.

Respondents were asked to provide information about their attempts at other certification examinations. Table DC-4 indicates that approximately 85% of Dental Hygiene department graduates attempted the New York State Practical Examination, the Northeast Regional Board Examination, or both examinations. This was a slightly greater

percentage of graduates than reported attempting the NBDHL examination.

Tables DC-5 through DC-14 contain Dental Hygiene department graduates' perception of the value of specific courses, in their curriculum at N.Y.C.C.C., as preparation for each section of NBDHL examination. It can be seen in Table DC-5 that graduates perceived Oral Hygiene Practice II and Oral Hygiene Practice III to be the most valuable and second most valuable courses respectively as preparation for the Oral Inspection section, and Public Health and Dental Specialties to be the least valuable and second least valuable courses, respectively, as preparation for the same section. Table DC-6 shows that the graduates perceive Dental Radiology Lab I to be the most valuable course and Dental Radiology Lab II the second most valuable course, and Organic Chemistry to be the least valuable course and Public Health to be the second least valuable course as preparation for the Radiograph section of NBDHL examination.

Data in Table DC-7 provide information relative to the Diagnostic Aids section of NBDHL. It is apparent that graduates perceive Oral Hygiene Practice II to be the most valuable course and Oral Hygiene Practice IV the second most valuable course as preparation for this section. They also perceive Organic Chemistry to be the least valuable course and Public Health to be the second least valuable course as preparation for the same section. The relative perceived value of courses as preparation for the Prophylaxis (Hand Scaling) section is

shown in Table DC-8. Oral Hygiene Practice III and Oral Hygiene Practice II are considered the most valuable course and second most valuable course, respectively; Public Health and Organic Chemistry are considered the least valuable course and second least valuable course, respectively. Table DC-9 provides the information that Dental Hygiene department graduates perceived Oral Hygiene Practice IV to be the most valuable course as preparation for the Prophylaxis (Ultrasonics) section of NBDHL and Oral Hygiene Practice III to be the second most valuable course as preparation for the same section; Organic Chemistry and Dental Specialties to be the least valuable course and Dental Specialties to be the second least valuable course as preparation for the same section.

Table DC-10 presents evidence that Oral Hygiene Practice IV and Oral Hygiene Practice III are perceived to be the most valuable and second most valuable course, respectively, as preparation for the Topical Agents section of NBDHL. Dental Radiology Lab I and Dental Specialties are perceived to be the least valuable and second least valuable course, respectively, for the Topical Agents section. Perceived value of courses as preparation for the Oral Health Instruction section is shown in Table DC-11. Oral Hygiene Practice IV is rated as most valuable and Oral Hygiene Practice III as second most valuable by graduates of Dental Hygiene. Dental Radiology Lab I and Dental Radiology Lab II are rated as least valuable and second least valuable, respectively. It can be seen in Table DC-12 that graduates perceive Dental

Assisting and Dental Materials to be the most valuable course and second most valuable course as preparation for the Supportive Treatment section, and Organic Chemistry and Microbiology to be the least valuable course and second least valuable course, respectively, for the same section.

Table DC-13 shows graduates of Dental Hygiene perceive Pharmacology to be the most valuable course as preparation for the Emergencies section of NBDHL examination, and Oral Hygiene Theory to be the second most valuable course as preparation for the same section. They also perceive Organic Chemistry and Dental Specialties to be the least valuable and second least valuable courses as preparation for the Emergencies section. The relative value of courses as preparation for the Community Health section are shown in Table DC-14. It can be seen that graduates perceive Public Health to be the most valuable course, Current Concepts in Dentistry the second most valuable course, Organic Chemistry the least valuable course, and Dental Materials the second least valuable course as preparation for this section.

Table DC-15 extends the same course by course ratings to Dental Hygiene department graduates' perception of value as preparation for actual job conditions. It can be seen from this table that graduates perceive Oral Hygiene Practice III to be the most valuable and Oral Hygiene Practice II to be the second most valuable course, respectively, and Organic Chemistry to be the least valuable and Dental Assisting to be the second least valuable course, respectively, as preparation for their

actual health service employment. It should be noted that of 22 possible most valuable, or second most valuable, course preferences, Oral Hygiene Practice II is specified five times, Oral Hygiene Practice III is specified six times, and Oral Hygiene Practice IV is specified four times. Of the 22 possible least valuable, or second least valuable, course preferences, Organic Chemistry is specified eight times, Dental Specialties is specified four times, and Public Health is specified four times, but Public Health is also specified most valuable one time.

Table DC-16 provides course grades of graduates of the Dental Hygiene department for selected Career Learning courses. It can be seen that the mean grade varies from 2.389 (Human Anatomy II) to 3.386 (Oral Hygiene Practice IV), a difference that is statistically significant at the .0001 level. The three courses perceived most valuable by graduates of the department, Oral Hygiene Practice II, Oral Hygiene Practice III, and Oral Hygiene Practice IV are also the three courses in which the graduates scored the highest grades. The three courses perceived least valuable by the graduates, Organic Chemistry, Public Health, and Dental Specialties showed close to the lowest mean grades and, in the case of Dental Specialties, showed no record of any graduate.

Graduates' perception of the course component that was the best preparation for each section of NBDHL is provided in Table DC-17.

It can be seen that the highest percentage of Dental Hygiene department graduates perceive Laboratories to be the best preparation for the Oral Inspection section, Radiographs section, Diagnostic Aids section, Prophylaxis (Hand Scaling) section, Prophylaxis (Ultrasonics) section, Topical Agents section and Supportive Treatment section. They also perceive Lectures to be the best preparation for the Oral Health Instruction section, Emergencies section, and Community Health section. Extremely few graduates perceived Written Assignments to be valuable as preparation for any section.

Tables DC-18 and DC-19 present Dental Hygiene department graduates' perception of their Career Learning instructors and teaching strategies as preparation for the various sections of NBDHL. It can be determined from Table DC-18 that the majority of graduates perceived their instructors to be Very Good or Excellent as help in preparing for the Oral Inspection section, Radiograph section, Prophylaxis Hand Scaling section, and Oral Health section. The majority of graduates perceived their instructors to be Good, Very Good, or Excellent as help in preparing for all other sections of NBDHL. Instructors' help was rated highest for the Oral Inspection section, lowest for the Community Health section. Table DC-19 shows the graduates' perception of teaching strategies most helpful as preparation for NBDHL. It can be seen from this table that Subject Matter Stressed is rated as most helpful for the Oral Inspection section; Method of Presentation is rated most helpful for the Radiographs section, Diagnostic Aids section, Topical Agents section, Oral Health section, Emergencies

section, Supportive Treatment section and Community Health section; Individual Assistance is rated most helpful for both Prophylaxis sections.

Tables DC-20 and DC-21 show Dental Hygiene department graduates' perceptions of their N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum as preparation for NBDHL and for each section of NBDHL. It can be seen in Table DC-20 that 86% of the graduates perceive their overall training to be Good, Very Good, or Excellent preparation for NBDHL and only 1.0% perceive it to be poor preparation for the examination. When analyzed by individual sections, as shown in Table DC-21, an extremely wide range of value is perceived by graduates. From a maximum of approximately 85% of department graduates who perceive their N.Y.C.C.C. training to be Good or Excellent preparation for the Prophylaxis Hand Scaling section of NBDHL, the percentage drops to a minimum of 25% who perceive their training to be Good or Excellent preparation for the Community Health section. Confirmation of this spread of perception is seen in the percentage of graduates who perceive their training as Poor or Very Poor. Only 1% of graduates selected either of these ratings for the Prophylaxis Hand Scaling section preparation whereas 31% selected them for Community Health section preparation. With the exception of preparation for Prophylaxis Ultrasonics, Supportive Treatment, Emergencies, and Community Health sections, over 85% of responding graduates of the Dental Hygiene department perceived their training to be Adequate, Good, or Excellent for the various sections of NBDHL.

To determine whether one or more course grades were predictive of success on the NBDHL examination, correlations between graduates' scores on the NBDHL and their course grades were computed. The following subjects, listed in decreasing order of significance, correlated at a significant level ($P > .01$) with the NBDHL:

Dental Radiology Lab I

Pharmacology

Human Anatomy and Physiology.

A high grade in Dental Radiology Lab I was most predictive of a high grade on the NBDHL examination, for all responding graduates of the Dental Hygiene department.

The correlations computed, although significant at the 0.01 level, were not particularly high. The highest correlation (Dental Radiology Lab I) was $r = 0.301$. With a sample of this size, correlations of the order of 0.5 and greater, with a significance level of 0.001, would be expected. Additionally, no correlation was found between graduates' course grades and the N.Y.S. Practical Examination or Northeast Regional Board Examination, indicating that graduates' grades at N.Y.C.C.C. were no indication of preparation for these examinations. It is suggested that the methods of evaluation of subject mastery in the Dental Hygiene department be thoroughly investigated as an initial step to make student grades at N.Y.C.C.C. more predictive of students' subject knowledge, ability, and eventual success on the various licensing examinations.

Table DC-1

Graduates' scores on National
Board Dental Hygiene Licensing
Examination

	10-25	26-40	41-55	56-70	71-85	86-100	Total
Number	4	3	3	15	59	22	106
Percent	3.8	2.8	2.8	14.2	55.7	20.8	100.0

Table DC-2

Graduates' report of number of attempts
needed to pass National Board Dental
Hygiene Licensing Examination

	1	2	3	4	5	More than 5	Did not pass
Number	84	12	1	1	0	1	2
Percent	83.2	11.9	1.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	2.0

Table DC-3

Year of graduates' attempts at
National Board Dental Hygiene Licensing
Examination

Year	1st attempt	2nd attempt	Total
1968	11	0	11
1969	10	0	10
1970	6	0	6
1971	15	0	15
1972	14	0	14
1973	21	0	21
1974	23	1	24
1975	0	2	2

Table DC-4

Graduates' report of other
examinations attempted

Examination	Number	Percentage
N.Y.S. Practical Examination	35	29.4
Northeast Regional Board Examination	10	8.4
Both above examinations	56	47.1
None	18	15.1

Graduates' perception of the value
of specific courses as preparation for
the Oral Inspection section of the
National Board Dental Hygiene Licensing
examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Oral Hygiene Theory	Number	41	46	18	2	4	9
	%	36.9	41.4	16.2	1.8	3.6	
Oral Hygiene Practice I	Number	70	23	13	2	2	4
	%	63.6	20.9	11.8	1.8	1.8	
Oral Anatomy	Number	73	27	10	3	0	3
	%	64.6	23.9	8.8	2.7	0.0	
Microbiology	Number	26	47	18	7	11	13
	%	23.9	43.1	16.5	6.4	10.1	
Oral Hygiene Practice II	Number	78	23	5	4	1	1
	%	70.3	20.7	4.5	3.6	0.9	
Dental Assisting	Number	14	35	32	13	16	16
	%	12.7	31.8	29.1	11.8	14.5	
Human Anatomy	Number	20	59	21	7	6	11
	%	17.7	52.2	18.6	6.2	5.3	
Organic Chemistry	Number	5	25	36	21	25	12
	%	4.5	22.3	32.1	18.8	22.3	
Pathology	Number	62	38	7	6	0	6
	%	54.9	33.6	6.2	5.3	0.0	
Oral Hygiene Practice III	Number	78	22	6	3	2	2
	%	70.3	19.8	5.4	2.7	1.8	
Pharmacology	Number	14	53	20	10	16	15
	%	12.4	46.9	17.7	8.8	14.2	
Dental Radiology Lab I	Number	60	24	9	11	6	8
	%	54.5	21.8	8.2	10.0	5.5	

(Table DC-5 continued)

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Periodontics	Number	50	36	2	12	9	10
	%	45.9	33.0	1.8	11.0	8.2	
Public Health	Number	12	30	34	16	21	19
	%	10.6	26.5	30.1	14.2	18.6	
Oral Hygiene Practice IV	Number	73	23	7	6	3	5
	%	65.2	20.5	6.3	5.4	2.7	
Dental Materials	Number	15	39	22	12	20	17
	%	13.9	36.1	20.4	11.1	18.5	
Dental Radiology Lab II	Number	62	26	12	5	6	7
	%	55.9	23.4	10.8	4.5	5.4	
Current Concepts in Dentistry	Number	23	42	16	5	14	14
	%	23.0	42.0	16.0	5.0	14.0	
Dental Specialties	Number	15	39	12	1	29	18
	%	15.6	40.6	12.5	1.0	30.2	

Table DC-6

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for the Radiographic section of the National Board Dental Hygiene Licensing examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Oral Hygiene Theory	Number	21	34	28	6	18	11
	%	19.6	31.8	26.2	5.6	16.8	
Oral Hygiene Practice I	Number	24	38	24	2	18	10
	%	22.6	35.8	22.6	1.9	17.0	
Oral Anatomy	Number	63	32	3	6	5	3
	%	57.8	29.4	2.8	5.5	4.6	
Microbiology	Number	7	24	28	5	30	14
	%	7.4	25.5	29.8	5.3	31.9	
Oral Hygiene Practice II	Number	30	38	24	0	17	7
	%	27.5	34.9	22.0	0.0	15.6	
Dental Assisting	Number	6	26	38	9	29	13
	%	5.6	24.1	35.2	8.3	26.9	
Human Anatomy	Number	23	43	24	5	13	8
	%	21.3	39.8	22.2	4.6	12.0	
Organic Chemistry	Number	5	7	42	36	10	19
	%	4.6	6.4	38.5	17.4	33.0	
Pathology	Number	52	42	8	1	5	4
	%	43.7	35.3	6.7	0.8	4.2	
Oral Hygiene Practice III	Number	36	31	15	0	15	9
	%	37.1	32.0	15.5	0.0	15.5	
Pharmacology	Number	10	19	35	6	36	15
	%	9.4	17.9	33.0	5.7	34.0	
Dental Radiology Lab I	Number	85	20	3	1	1	1
	%	77.3	18.2	2.7	0.9	0.9	

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Periodontics	Number	33	53	9	0	13	6
	%	30.6	49.1	8.3	0.0	12.0	
Public Health	Number	5	12	40	12	40	18
	%	4.6	11.0	36.7	11.0	36.7	
Oral Hygiene Practice IV	Number	33	39	15	8	14	5
	%	30.3	35.8	13.8	7.3	12.8	
Dental Materials	Number	6	27	24	12	37	16
	%	5.7	25.5	22.6	11.3	34.9	
Dental Radiology Lab II	Number	72	24	4	4	6	2
	%	65.5	21.8	3.6	3.6	5.5	
Current Concepts in Dentistry	Number	14	28	23	6	27	12
	%	14.3	28.6	23.5	6.1	27.6	
Dental Specialties	Number	6	23	16	7	44	17
	%	6.3	24.0	16.7	7.3	45.8	

Table DC-7

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for the Diagnostic Aids section of the National Board Dental Hygiene Licensing examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Oral Hygiene Theory	Number	39	40	3	6	6	7
	%	41.5	42.6	3.2	6.4	6.4	
Oral Hygiene Practice I	Number	42	37	4	2	8	6
	%	45.2	39.8	4.3	2.2	8.8	
Oral Anatomy	Number	39	37	5	8	1	5
	%	43.3	41.1	5.6	8.9	1.1	
Microbiology	Number	21	32	19	4	16	13
	%	22.8	34.8	20.7	4.3	17.4	
Oral Hygiene Practice II	Number	45	37	0	0	4	1
	%	52.3	43.0	0.0	0.0	4.7	
Dental Assisting	Number	16	40	19	3	12	12
	%	17.8	44.4	21.1	3.3	13.3	
Human Anatomy	Number	17	41	12	5	15	14
	%	18.9	45.6	13.3	5.6	16.7	
Organic Chemistry	Number	0	17	29	13	29	19
	%	0.0	19.3	33.0	14.8	32.9	
Pathology	Number	30	45	4	7	4	9
	%	33.3	50.0	4.4	7.8	4.4	
Oral Hygiene Practice III	Number	38	40	2	3	6	8
	%	42.7	44.9	2.3	3.4	6.7	
Pharmacology	Number	5	33	17	8	14	16
	%	6.5	42.9	22.1	10.4	18.2	
Dental Radiology Lab I	Number	38	37	5	3	6	3
	%	42.7	41.6	5.6	3.4	6.7	

(Cont. next page)

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Periodontics	Number	25	44	4	1	12	10
	%	29.1	51.2	4.7	1.2	14.0	
Public Health	Number	6	21	27	9	24	18
	%	6.9	24.1	31.0	10.3	27.5	
Oral Hygiene Practice IV	Number	42	39	0	0	9	2
	%	46.7	43.3	0.0	0.0	10.0	
Dental Materials	Number	10	31	21	4	17	15
	%	12.0	37.3	25.3	4.8	20.5	
Dental Radiology Lab II	Number	36	38	3	1	8	4
	%	41.9	44.2	3.5	1.2	9.3	
Current Concepts in Dentistry	Number	19	39	13	1	12	11
	%	22.6	46.4	15.5	1.2	14.3	
Dental Specialties	Number	12	28	16	2	26	17
	%	14.3	33.3	19.0	2.4	31.0	

Graduates' perception of the value of
specific courses as preparation for the
Prophylaxis A section of the National
Board Dental Hygiene Licensing examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Oral Hygiene Theory	Number	55	29	5	2	4	6
	%	57.9	30.5	5.3	2.1	4.2	
Oral Hygiene Practice I	Number	86	18	1	0	1	3
	%	79.6	16.7	2.8	0.0	0.9	
Oral Anatomy	Number	67	29	5	0	6	5
	%	62.6	27.1	4.7	0.0	5.6	
Microbiology	Number	18	32	28	5	23	13
	%	17.0	30.2	26.4	4.7	21.7	
Oral Hygiene Practice II	Number	84	22	1	0	0	2
	%	78.5	20.6	0.9	0.0	0.0	
Dental Assisting	Number	10	31	31	8	23	16
	%	9.7	30.1	30.1	7.8	22.3	
Human Anatomy	Number	18	39	22	8	18	10
	%	17.1	37.1	21.0	7.6	17.1	
Organic Chemistry	Number	5	19	34	14	32	18
	%	4.8	18.3	32.7	13.5	30.8	
Pathology	Number	36	35	20	1	14	8
	%	34.0	33.0	18.9	0.9	13.2	
Oral Hygiene Practice III	Number	88	16	2	0	0	1
	%	83.0	15.1	1.9	0.0	0.0	
Pharmacology	Number	17	30	21	7	30	15
	%	16.2	28.6	20.0	6.7	28.6	
Dental Radiology Lab I	Number	17	38	22	2	26	12
	%	16.2	36.2	21.0	1.9	24.8	

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Periodontics	Number	62	30	3	1	7	7
	%	60.2	29.1	2.9	1.0	6.8	
Public Health	Number	6	19	31	14	35	19
	%	5.7	18.1	29.5	13.3	33.3	
Oral Hygiene Practice IV	Number	84	17	5	1	1	4
	%	77.8	15.7	4.6	0.9	0.9	
Dental Materials	Number	18	33	22	4	28	14
	%	17.1	31.4	21.0	3.8	26.7	
Dental Radiology Lab II	Number	25	32	19	2	25	11
	%	24.3	31.1	18.4	1.9	24.3	
Current Concepts in Dentistry	Number	21	34	19	2	21	9
	%	21.6	35.1	19.6	2.1	21.6	
Dental Specialties	Number	6	28	19	2	38	17
	%	6.5	30.1	20.4	2.2	40.9	

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for the Prophylaxis B section of the National Board Dental Hygiene Licensing examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Oral Hygiene Theory	Number	26	32	14	6	8	5
	%	30.2	37.2	16.3	7.0	9.3	
Oral Hygiene Practice I	Number	37	26	18	7	10	6
	%	37.8	26.5	18.4	7.1	10.2	
Oral Anatomy	Number	36	31	14	4	14	7
	%	36.4	31.3	14.1	4.0	14.1	
Microbiology	Number	14	21	32	6	26	11
	%	14.1	21.2	32.3	6.1	26.3	
Oral Hygiene Practice II	Number	40	32	12	4	10	3
	%	40.8	32.7	12.2	4.1	10.2	
Dental Assisting	Number	8	28	26	10	24	13
	%	8.3	29.2	27.1	10.4	25.0	
Human Anatomy	Number	7	24	34	7	27	15
	%	7.1	24.2	34.3	7.1	27.3	
Organic Chemistry	Number	6	10	36	15	31	19
	%	6.1	10.2	36.7	15.3	31.6	
Pathology	Number	13	30	23	7	23	9
	%	13.5	31.3	24.0	7.3	24.0	
Oral Hygiene Practice III	Number	55	28	8	3	5	2
	%	55.6	28.3	8.1	3.0	5.1	
Pharmacology	Number	11	18	30	7	30	16
	%	11.5	18.8	31.3	7.3	31.3	
Dental Radiology Lab I	Number	11	24	28	6	29	14
	%	11.2	24.5	28.6	6.1	29.6	

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Periodontics	Number	40	31	9	5	13	4
	%	40.8	31.6	9.2	5.1	13.3	
Public Health	Number	7	15	33	15	26	17
	%	7.3	15.6	34.4	15.6	27.1	
Oral Hygiene Practice IV	Number	59	27	5	4	26	1
	%	59.0	27.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	
Dental Materials	Number	15	26	25	4	26	10
	%	15.6	27.1	26.0	4.2	27.1	
Dental Radiology Lab II	Number	12	24	27	5	28	12
	%	12.5	25.0	28.1	5.2	29.2	
Current Concepts in Dentistry	Number	23	24	16	3	25	8
	%	25.3	26.4	17.6	3.3	27.5	
Dental Specialties	Number	7	16	25	2	32	18
	%	5.9	13.4	21.0	1.7	26.9	

Graduates' perception of the value of
specific courses as preparation for the
Topical Agents section of the National
Board Dental Hygiene Licensing examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Oral Hygiene Theory	Number	35	47	6	1	6	4
	%	36.8	49.5	6.3	1.1	6.3	
Oral Hygiene Practice I	Number	34	38	12	3	9	5
	%	35.4	39.6	12.5	3.1	9.4	
Oral Anatomy	Number	23	36	19	3	15	6
	%	24.0	37.5	19.8	3.1	15.6	
Microbiology	Number	8	27	32	4	25	14
	%	8.3	28.1	33.3	4.2	26.0	
Oral Hygiene Practice II	Number	48	34	8	1	5	3
	%	50.0	35.4	8.3	1.0	5.2	
Dental Assisting	Number	7	45	25	5	15	9
	%	7.2	46.4	25.8	5.2	15.5	
Human Anatomy	Number	8	20	36	6	25	15
	%	8.4	21.1	37.9	6.3	26.3	
Organic Chemistry	Number	5	21	37	8	24	16
	%	5.3	22.1	38.9	8.4	25.3	
Pathology	Number	9	32	28	3	23	12
	%	9.5	33.7	29.5	3.2	24.3	
Oral Hygiene Practice III	Number	59	28	3	2	4	2
	%	49.6	23.5	2.5	1.7	3.4	
Pharmacology	Number	15	38	21	4	18	10
	%	15.6	39.6	21.9	4.2	18.8	
Dental Radiology Lab I	Number	8	18	30	4	35	19
	%	8.4	18.9	31.6	4.2	36.8	

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Periodontics	Number	9	32	21	2	25	13
	%	10.1	36.0	23.6	2.2	28.1	
Public Health	Number	14	28	30	6	17	11
	%	14.7	29.5	31.6	6.3	17.9	
Oral Hygiene Practice IV	Number	58	30	3	2	3	1
	%	60.4	31.3	3.1	2.1	3.1	
Dental Materials	Number	15	39	24	2	14	7
	%	16.0	41.5	25.5	2.1	14.9	
Dental Radiology Lab II	Number	9	20	30	3	33	17
	%	9.5	21.1	31.6	3.2	34.7	
Current Concepts in Dentistry	Number	14	38	14	2	20	8
	%	15.9	43.2	15.9	2.3	22.7	
Dental Specialties	Number	7	21	20	2	31	18
	%	8.6	25.9	24.7	2.5	38.3	

Graduates' perception of the value of
specific courses as preparation for the
Oral Health Instruction section of the National
Board Dental Hygiene Licensing examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Oral Hygiene Theory	Number	51	42	8	3	3	4
	%	47.7	39.3	7.5	2.8	2.8	
Oral Hygiene Practice I	Number	48	42	12	4	1	5
	%	44.9	39.3	11.2	3.7	0.9	
Oral Anatomy	Number	34	42	16	1	14	8
	%	31.8	39.3	15.0	0.9	13.1	
Microbiology	Number	24	47	17	0	15	9
	%	23.1	45.2	16.3	0.0	15.4	
Oral Hygiene Practice II	Number	56	43	6	1	1	3
	%	52.3	40.2	5.6	0.9	0.9	
Dental Assisting	Number	12	36	30	7	20	15
	%	11.4	34.3	28.6	6.7	19.0	
Human Anatomy	Number	18	34	28	6	20	13
	%	17.0	32.1	26.4	5.7	18.9	
Organic Chemistry	Number	11	30	33	5	25	16
	%	10.6	28.8	31.7	4.8	24.0	
Pathology	Number	35	52	7	1	10	7
	%	33.3	49.5	6.7	1.0	9.5	
Oral Hygiene Practice III	Number	62	39	5	1	0	2
	%	57.9	36.4	4.7	0.9	0.0	
Pharmacology	Number	15	43	26	3	17	11
	%	14.4	41.3	25.0	2.9	16.3	
Dental Radiology Lab I	Number	12	23	27	3	36	19
	%	11.9	22.8	26.7	3.0	35.6	

(Cont. next page)

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Periodontics	Number	40	49	7	1	5	6
	%	39.2	48.0	6.9	1.0	4.9	
Public Health	Number	19	36	23	8	17	12
	%	18.4	35.0	22.3	7.8	16.5	
Oral Hygiene Practice IV	Number	68	36	2	1	0	1
	%	63.6	33.6	1.9	0.9	0.0	
Dental Materials	Number	15	36	22	7	19	14
	%	15.2	36.4	22.2	7.1	19.2	
Dental Radiology Lab II	Number	11	30	27	2	32	18
	%	10.8	29.4	26.5	1.0	31.4	
Current Concepts in Dentistry	Number	25	41	10	1	19	10
	%	26.0	42.7	10.4	1.0	19.8	
Dental Specialties	Number	11	32	18	1	28	17
	%	12.2	35.6	20.0	1.1	31.1	

Graduates' perception of the value of
specific courses as preparation for the
Supportive Treatment section of the National
Board Dental Hygiene Licensing examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Oral Hygiene Theory	Number	15	39	17	0	14	5
	%	17.6	45.9	20.0	0.0	16.5	
Oral Hygiene Practice I	Number	15	32	21	1	15	7
	%	17.9	38.1	25.0	1.2	17.9	
Oral Anatomy	Number	7	31	24	2	27	13
	%	7.7	34.1	26.4	2.2	29.7	
Microbiology	Number	7	13	35	0	37	18
	%	7.6	14.1	38.0	0.0	40.2	
Oral Hygiene Practice II	Number	24	33	19	0	16	4
	%	26.1	35.9	20.7	0.0	17.4	
Dental Assisting	Number	27	47	14	1	4	1
	%	29.0	50.5	15.1	1.1	4.3	
Human Anatomy	Number	9	19	30	1	33	16
	%	9.8	20.7	32.6	1.1	35.9	
Organic Chemistry	Number	3	20	28	6	35	19
	%	3.3	21.7	30.4	6.5	38.0	
Pathology	Number	6	27	25	2	31	15
	%	6.6	29.7	27.5	2.2	34.1	
Oral Hygiene Practice III	Number	22	32	19	1	17	6
	%	24.2	35.2	20.9	1.1	18.7	
Pharmacology	Number	8	36	23	3	22	11
	%	8.7	39.1	25.0	3.3	23.9	
Dental Radiology Lab I	Number	14	28	25	0	27	12
	%	14.9	29.8	26.6	0.0	28.7	

(Cont. next page)

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Periodontics	Number	11	31	23	0	24	9
	%	12.4	34.8	25.8	0.0	27.0	
Public Health	Number	6	14	32	7	31	17
	%	6.7	15.6	35.6	7.8	34.4	
Oral Hygiene Practice IV	Number	26	38	14	0	14	3
	%	28.3	41.3	15.2	0.0	15.2	
Dental Materials	Number	42	25	15	2	9	2
	%	45.2	26.9	16.1	2.2	9.7	
Dental Radiology Lab II	Number	14	27	25	2	24	10
	%	15.2	29.3	27.2	2.2	26.1	
Current Concepts in Dentistry	Number	11	34	19	2	20	8
	%	12.8	39.5	22.1	2.3	23.3	
Dental Specialties	Number	10	25	18	2	27	14
	%	12.2	30.5	22.0	2.4	32.9	

Graduates' perception of the value of
specific courses as preparation for the
Emergencies section of the National
Board Dental Hygiene Licensing examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Oral Hygiene Theory	Number	26	37	15	1	13	2
	%	28.3	40.2	16.3	1.1	14.1	
Oral Hygiene Practice I	Number	21	31	27	2	10	6
	%	23.1	34.1	29.7	2.2	11.0	
Oral Anatomy	Number	15	34	18	1	24	10
	%	16.3	37.0	19.6	1.1	26.1	
Microbiology	Number	8	21	28	4	29	15
	%	8.9	23.3	31.1	4.4	32.2	
Oral Hygiene Practice II	Number	23	33	19	1	14	7
	%	25.6	36.7	21.1	1.1	15.6	
Dental Assisting	Number	18	45	16	2	10	4
	%	19.8	49.5	17.6	2.2	11.0	
Human Anatomy	Number	15	38	19	2	17	9
	%	16.5	41.8	20.9	2.2	18.7	
Organic Chemistry	Number	3	9	33	4	39	19
	%	3.4	10.2	37.5	4.5	44.3	
Pathology	Number	23	33	14	1	18	8
	%	25.8	37.1	15.7	1.1	20.2	
Oral Hygiene Practice III	Number	27	29	19	1	12	3
	%	30.7	33.0	21.6	1.1	13.6	
Pharmacology	Number	28	35	13	2	12	1
	%	31.1	38.9	14.4	2.2	13.3	
Dental Radiology Lab I	Number	11	16	26	1	34	16
	%	12.5	18.2	29.5	1.1	38.6	

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Periodontics	Number	13	21	20	1	28	12
	%	15.7	25.3	24.1	1.2	33.7	
Public Health	Number	8	20	26	7	26	14
	%	9.2	23.0	29.9	8.0	29.9	
Oral Hygiene Practice IV	Number	23	33	18	1	14	5
	%	25.8	37.1	20.2	1.1	15.7	
Dental Materials	Number	8	29	19	3	28	13
	%	9.2	33.3	21.8	3.4	32.2	
Dental Radiology Lab II	Number	10	17	26	0	34	17
	%	11.5	19.5	29.9	0.0	39.1	
Current Concepts in Dentistry	Number	12	29	15	4	21	11
	%	14.8	35.8	18.5	4.9	25.9	
Dental Specialties	Number	7	18	18	4	31	18
	%	9.0	23.1	23.1	5.1	39.7	

Table DC-14

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for the Community Health section of the National Board Dental Hygiene Licensing examination

109

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Oral Hygiene Theory	Number	15	30	17	4	18	4
	%	17.9	35.7	20.2	4.8	21.4	
Oral Hygiene Practice I	Number	12	22	22	6	21	10
	%	14.5	26.5	26.5	7.2	25.3	
Oral Anatomy	Number	11	23	24	7	27	15
	%	12.0	25.0	26.1	7.6	29.3	
Microbiology	Number	13	21	25	5	27	12
	%	14.3	23.1	27.5	5.5	29.7	
Oral Hygiene Practice II	Number	19	24	23	3	22	5
	%	20.9	26.4	25.3	3.3	24.2	
Dental Assisting	Number	17	24	20	5	24	8
	%	18.9	26.9	22.2	5.6	26.7	
Human Anatomy	Number	11	22	26	7	26	14
	%	12.0	23.9	28.3	7.6	28.3	
Organic Chemistry	Number	3	13	30	10	35	19
	%	3.3	14.3	33.0	11.0	38.5	
Pathology	Number	12	30	22	5	24	9
	%	12.9	32.3	23.7	5.4	25.8	
Oral Hygiene Practice III	Number	15	31	21	3	22	6
	%	16.3	33.7	22.8	3.3	23.9	
Pharmacology	Number	7	32	21	5	27	13
	%	7.6	34.8	22.8	5.4	29.3	
Dental Radiology Lab I	Number	17	12	24	8	31	17
	%	18.5	13.0	26.1	8.7	33.7	

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Periodontics	Number	13	29	19	4	23	7
	%	14.8	33.0	21.6	4.5	26.1	
Public Health	Number	37	26	19	8	5	1
	%	38.9	27.4	20.0	8.4	5.3	
Oral Hygiene Practice IV	Number	20	28	19	3	22	3
	%	21.7	30.4	20.7	3.3	23.9	
Dental Materials	Number	13	16	24	4	32	18
	%	14.6	18.0	27.0	4.5	36.0	
Dental Radiology Lab II	Number	17	11	27	4	32	16
	%	18.7	12.1	29.7	4.4	35.2	
Current Concepts in Dentistry	Number	17	33	16	6	14	2
	%	19.8	38.4	18.6	7.0	16.3	
Dental Specialties	Number	11	24	18	4	26	11
	%	13.3	28.9	21.7	4.8	31.3	

Table DC-15

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for actual employment conditions

111

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Oral Hygiene Theory	Number	42	47	7	1	6	10
	%	40.8	45.6	6.8	1.0	5.8	
Oral Hygiene Practice I	Number	53	32	9	3	5	8
	%	52.0	31.4	8.8	2.9	4.9	
Oral Anatomy	Number	52	44	3	0	2	3
	%	51.5	43.6	3.0	0.0	2.0	
Microbiology	Number	19	49	18	10	6	14
	%	18.6	48.0	17.6	9.8	5.9	
Oral Hygiene Practice II	Number	63	27	6	1	4	2
	%	62.4	26.7	5.9	1.0	4.0	
Dental Assisting	Number	25	38	24	10	3	18
	%	25.0	38.0	24.0	10.0	3.0	
Human Anatomy	Number	25	55	15	3	4	13
	%	24.5	53.9	14.7	2.9	3.9	
Organic Chemistry	Number	8	18	42	21	13	19
	%	7.8	17.6	41.2	20.6	12.7	
Pathology	Number	45	48	6	0	2	7
	%	44.6	47.5	5.9	0.0	2.0	
Oral Hygiene Practice III	Number	68	23	8	0	3	1
	%	66.7	22.5	7.8	0.0	2.9	
Pharmacology	Number	22	61	13	4	2	12
	%	21.6	59.8	12.7	3.9	2.0	
Dental Radiology Lab I	Number	57	32	10	1	2	6
	%	55.9	31.4	9.8	1.0	2.0	

(Cont. next page)

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Periodontics	Number	46	40	5	0	7	9
	%	46.9	40.8	5.1	0.0	7.1	
Public Health	Number	21	30	33	14	5	17
	%	20.4	29.1	32.0	13.6	4.9	
Oral Hygiene Practice IV	Number	73	21	6	0	3	4
	%	70.9	20.4	5.8	0.0	2.9	
Dental Materials	Number	26	43	18	5	6	15
	%	26.3	43.4	18.2	5.1	6.1	
Dental Radiology Lab II	Number	60	31	7	2	2	5
	%	58.8	30.4	6.9	2.0	2.0	
Current Concepts in Dentistry	Number	32	44	5	6	6	11
	%	34.4	47.3	5.4	6.5	6.5	
Dental Specialties	Number	21	36	11	3	16	16
	%	24.1	41.4	12.6	3.4	18.4	

Graduates' grades for selected
Career Learning courses

Course							<u>Mean Grade</u>	
		A	B	C	D	Other	Standard Deviation	
Oral Hygiene Theory	Number	10	16	10	0	83	3.000	
	%	8.4	13.4	8.4	0.0	69.7	0.756	
Oral Hygiene Practice 1	Number	32	49	19	2	17	3.088	
	%	26.9	41.2	16.0	1.7	14.3	0.759	
Oral Hygiene Practice 2	Number	34	57	12	0	16	3.214	
	%	28.6	47.9	10.1	0.0	13.4	0.636	
Oral Hygiene Practice 3	Number	27	67	5	1	19	3.200	
	%	22.7	56.3	4.2	0.8	16.0	0.569	
Oral Hygiene Practice 4	Number	42	56	3	0	18	3.386	
	%	35.3	47.1	2.5	0.0	15.1	0.547	
Oral Anatomy	Number	37	44	20	2	16	3.126	
	%	31.1	37.0	16.8	1.7	13.4	0.778	
Microbiology 1	Number	16	33	23	5	42	2.779	
	%	13.4	27.7	19.3	4.2	35.3	0.853	
Dental Assisting	Number	29	49	17	2	22	3.082	
	%	24.4	41.2	14.3	1.7	18.5	0.745	
Human Anatomy 1	Number	15	35	40	13	16	2.505	
	%	12.6	29.4	33.6	10.9	13.4	0.895	
Human Anatomy 2	Number	1	7	8	2	101	2.389	
	%	0.8	5.9	6.7	1.7	84.9	0.778	
Organic Chemistry	Number	29	33	38	3	16	2.854	
	%	24.4	27.7	31.9	2.5	13.4	0.868	

(continued next page)

Course		A	B	C	D	Other	Mean Grade Standard Deviation
Pathology	Number	5	21	8	1	84	2.857
	%	4.2	17.6	6.7	0.8	70.6	0.692
Pharmacology	Number	19	61	19	3	17	2.941
	%	16.0	51.3	16.0	2.5	14.3	0.701
Dental Radiology 1	Number	21	46	32	3	17	2.833
	%	17.6	38.7	26.9	2.5	14.3	0.785
Dental Radiology 2	Number	13	59	26	2	19	2.830
	%	10.9	49.6	21.8	1.7	16.0	0.667
Dental Radiology Lab	Number	21	30	29	2	37	2.819
	%	17.6	25.2	24.4	1.7	31.1	0.885
Periodontics	Number	2	8	7	1	101	2.611
	%	1.7	6.7	5.9	0.8	84.9	0.778
Public Health	Number	28	36	32	7	16	2.825
	%	23.5	30.3	26.9	5.9	13.4	0.912
Dental Materials	Number	2	15	3	0	99	2.950
	%	1.7	12.6	2.5	0.0	83.2	0.510
English Composition	Number	24	47	16	3	29	3.022
	%	20.2	39.5	13.4	2.5	24.4	0.764

Graduates' perception of course components for each section of National Board Dental Hygiene Licensing Examination

Section		Labs	Reading Material	Written Assignments	Exams	Review Seminars	Lectures	Discussion
Oral Inspection	Number	68	10	0	3	8	10	10
	%	62.4	9.2	0.0	2.8	7.3	9.2	9.2
Radiographs	Number	53	4	2	7	10	24	9
	%	48.6	3.7	1.8	6.4	9.2	22.0	8.3
Diagnostic Aids	Number	37	15	3	4	11	17	14
	%	36.6	14.9	3.0	4.0	10.9	16.8	13.9
Prophylaxis a. Hand Scaling	Number	84	1	1	0	2	2	4
	%	89.4	1.1	1.1	0.0	2.1	2.1	4.3
b. Ultra-sonics	Number	62	11	0	0	1	5	9
	%	70.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	1.1	5.7	10.3
Topical Agents (fluorides)	Number	63	15	2	3	3	7	14
	%	58.9	14.0	1.9	2.8	2.8	6.5	13.0
Oral Health Instruction Nutrition	Number	6	20	8	8	2	45	19
	%	5.8	19.4	7.8	7.8	1.9	43.7	13.6
Emergencies	Number	6	26	3	2	7	44	12
	%	6.0	26.0	3.0	2.0	7.0	44.0	12.0
Supportive Treatment Dental Mat.	Number	29	32	1	2	9	23	6
	%	28.4	31.4	1.0	2.0	8.8	22.5	5.9
Community Health	Number	1	21	4	3	9	39	19
	%	1.0	21.9	4.2	3.1	9.4	40.6	19.8

Graduates' perception of Career
Learning instructors' help as
preparation for each section of
National Board Dental Hygiene Licensing examination

Section		Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Oral Inspection	Number	50	30	19	2	2
	%	48.5	29.1	18.4	1.9	1.9
Radiographs	Number	42	25	16	14	6
	%	40.8	24.3	15.5	13.6	5.8
Diagnostic Aids	Number	16	26	34	15	0
	%	17.6	28.6	37.4	16.5	0.0
Prophylaxis a. Hand Scaling	Number	60	18	12	6	0
	%	62.5	18.8	12.5	6.3	0.0
b. Ultra-sonics	Number	22	12	25	20	14
	%	23.7	12.9	26.9	21.5	15.1
Topical Agents (fluorides)	Number	15	24	39	12	4
	%	16.0	25.5	41.5	12.8	4.3
Oral Health Instruction Nutrition	Number	25	27	34	8	0
	%	26.6	28.7	36.2	8.5	0.0
Emergencies	Number	11	12	35	25	10
	%	11.8	12.9	37.6	26.9	10.8
Supportive Treatment Dental Mat.	Number	14	27	27	19	3
	%	15.6	30.0	30.0	21.1	3.3
Community Health	Number	10	11	22	35	17
	%	10.5	11.6	23.2	36.8	17.9

Graduates' perception of teaching strategy
as best preparation for each section of
National Board Dental Hygiene Licensing
examination

Section		Subject matter stressed	Method of presentation of material	Response to questions	Teachers' comments	Individual assistance	Teaching aids
Oral Inspection	Number	35	13	4	18	30	9
	%	32.1	11.9	3.7	16.5	27.5	8.2
Radiographs	Number	24	29	7	10	24	11
	%	22.9	27.6	6.7	9.5	22.9	10.5
Diagnostic Aids	Number	14	26	5	9	15	13
	%	17.1	31.7	6.1	11.0	18.3	15.9
Prophylaxis a. Hand Scaling	Number	23	14	2	8	45	5
	%	23.7	14.4	2.1	8.2	46.4	5.2
b. Ultra- sonics	Number	7	15	6	7	39	14
	%	8.0	17.0	6.8	8.0	44.3	15.9
Topical Agents (fluorides)	Number	19	45	8	3	21	7
	%	18.4	43.7	7.8	2.9	20.4	6.8
Oral Health Instruction Nutrition	Number	35	42	13	13	1	3
	%	32.7	39.3	12.1	12.1	0.9	2.8
Emergencies	Number	27	30	24	13	2	6
	%	26.5	29.4	23.5	12.7	2.0	5.9
Supportive Treatment Dental Mat.	Number	23	36	16	13	2	9
	%	23.2	36.4	16.2	13.1	2.0	9.1
Community Health	Number	20	42	15	19	0	5
	%	19.8	41.6	14.9	18.8	0.0	5.0

Table DC-20

Graduates' perception of N.Y.C.C.C.
curriculum as preparation for the
National Board Dental Hygiene Licensing
examination

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Total
Number	15	28	43	13	1	100
Percent	15.0	28.0	43.0	13.0	1.0	100.0

Graduates' perception of N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum as preparation for each section of National Board Dental Licensing examination

Section		Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very Poor
Oral Inspection	Number	45	34	19	1	0
	%	45.5	34.3	19.2	1.0	0.0
Radiographs	Number	28	32	23	11	4
	%	28.6	32.7	23.5	11.2	4.1
Diagnostic Aids	Number	15	33	44	1	0
	%	16.1	35.5	47.3	1.1	0.0
Prophylaxis a. Hand Scaling	Number	49	34	14	1	0
	%	50.0	34.7	14.3	1.0	0.0
b. Ultra-sonics	Number	11	18	33	26	9
	%	11.3	18.6	34.0	26.8	9.3
Topical Agents (fluorides)	Number	14	29	45	6	2
	%	14.6	30.2	46.9	6.3	2.1
Oral Health Instruction Nutrition	Number	28	37	27	7	0
	%	28.3	37.4	27.3	7.1	0.0
Emergencies	Number	8	25	41	18	4
	%	8.3	26.0	42.7	18.8	4.2
Supportive Treatment Dental Mat.	Number	3	25	35	28	7
	%	3.1	25.5	35.7	28.6	7.1
Community Health	Number	5	20	43	20	11
	%	5.1	20.2	43.4	20.2	11.1

Medical Laboratory Certification Section

To measure the success of graduates of the Medical Laboratory Department of N.Y.C.C.C. on the MLT/ASCP Certification Examination (MLT/ASCP) and to evaluate their perception of the value of various components of N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum as preparation for MLT/ASCP, this section of the division evaluation was prepared. Eighty-nine Medical Laboratory department graduates responded to the questionnaire mailed to all graduates; 16 respondents (17.9%) indicated they took the MLT/ASCP. The data herein is representative of these respondents.

As indicated above, 16 Medical Laboratory department graduates reported taking the MLT/ASCP. Of that number, 13 reported passing the examination on the first attempt and 3 reported not passing the examination. None of the 3 graduates reporting non-passing reported a second attempt at passing. Scores on the MLT/ASCP were obtained for 5 graduates. They are presented in Table MC-1. It can be seen that the mean score is 84.60, the lowest score is 60, and the highest score is 101.

Table MC-2 provides information indicating the year in which Medical Laboratory department graduates attempted the MLT/ASCP. It can be seen that the earliest year reported was 1969, and that the year in which the greatest number of graduates (43.8%) attempted the examination was 1973. Table MC-3 lists the number of respondents who attempted other examinations. Thirty-eight Medical Laboratory department graduates reported an attempt at one of the three examinations listed.

Tables MC-4 through MC-10 contain Medical Laboratory department graduates' perception of the value of specific courses, in their curriculum at N.Y.C.C.C., as preparation for each section of MLT/ASCP. It can be seen in Table MC-4 that graduates perceive Clinical Lab (Hospital) to be the most valuable course and Histology to be the least valuable course as preparation for the Microbiology section of MLT/ASCP. Table MC-5 indicates graduates' perception of the most valued course and least valued course as preparation for the Serology section to be Clinical

Lab (Hospital) and Clinical Lab (Chemistry) respectively. Table MC-6 presents data showing Clinical Lab (Hospital) to be perceived as the most valuable course as preparation for the Clinical Chemistry section and Histology to be perceived as the least valuable course as preparation for the same section.

It is evident from Table MC-7 that Hematology is the course perceived most valued as preparation for the Hematology section of MLT/ASCP, and Microbiology I is the least valued course as preparation for the same section. The most valuable course as preparation for the Urinalysis section is perceived to be Clinical Lab (Hospital), as shown in Table MC-8. For the same section, Microbiology I is perceived to be the least valuable course. Table MC-9 shows Medical Laboratory department graduates' perception of the most valuable course as preparation for the Blood Banking section is again Clinical Lab (Hospital) and the course perceived least valuable as preparation for this section is Histology. Table MC-10 lists the graduates' perception of the value of courses as preparation for the Parasitology section. Clinical Lab(Hospital) is perceived to be most valuable and Clinical Lab (Chemistry) is perceived the least valuable.

Table MC-11 extends the same course by course ratings to Medical Laboratory department graduates' perception of value as preparation for actual job conditions. It can be seen in this table that graduates

perceive Clinical Lab (Hospital) as the most valuable course, and Histology as the least valuable course as preparation for actual health service employment. It is apparent that certain courses are perceived most valuable and least valuable as preparation for both actual employment conditions and MLT/ASCP sections. Clinical Lab (Hospital) was perceived to be the most valuable course for six of the seven sections of MLT/ASCP, and also for actual employment conditions. Histology was perceived to be the least valuable course for three of the seven sections of MLT/ASCP and also for actual employment conditions.

Table MC-12 provides course grades of graduates of the Medical Laboratory department for selected Career Learning courses. It should be noted that except for the three mathematics courses taken by less than 50% of graduates, slightly more than 50% of the responding graduates took any of the courses. It can be seen that the mean grade varies from a high of 3.130 (Microbiology II) to a low of 2.037 (Math Analysis 2) a difference that is statistically significant to a probability level of .0001.

Graduates' perception of the course component that was the best preparation for each section of the MLT/ASCP is provided in Table MC-13. It can be seen that the highest percentage of Medical Laboratory department graduates perceived Lectures to be the best preparation for the Microbiology section of the MLT/ASCP; Reading Material to be the

best preparation for the Serology section; Laboratories to be the best preparation for the Clinical Chemistry and Urinalysis sections; Lectures to be the best preparation for the Hematology section; Reading Material to be the best preparation for the Blood Banking and Parasitology sections.

Tables MC-14 and MC-15 present Medical Laboratory graduates' perception of their Career Learning instructors and their teaching strategies as help in preparing for the various sections of the MLT/ASCP. It can be determined from Table MC-14 that the majority of graduates perceived their instructors to be excellent, very good, or good as help in preparing for all sections of the examination, but considerable variation existed between the various sections. Instructors' help was most highly rated for the Microbiology section, lowest rating for the Parasitology section. Table MC-15 shows the graduates' perceptions of teaching strategies most helpful as preparation for the MLT/ASCP sections. It can be seen that for Clinical Chemistry and Hematology, subject matter stressed by the instructor was considered most helpful; for Microbiology, Serology and Urinalysis, method of presentation of material was perceived most helpful; for Blood Banking and Parasitology the data is inconclusive.

Tables MC-16 and MC-17 supply Medical Laboratory department graduates' perceptions of their N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum as preparation for the

MLT/ASCP and for each section of MLT/ASCP. It can be seen in Table MC-16 that 70% of all the graduates perceive their training at N.Y.C.C.C. to be good, very good, or excellent preparation for MLT/ASCP and 10% perceive the training to be poor preparation for the examination. A section by section examination as shown in Table MC-17 indicates that although a majority of graduates consider the N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum to be good or excellent preparation for the Microbiology, Clinical Chemistry, and Hematology sections, a majority also consider the N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum to be poor or very poor as preparation for the Serology, Blood Banking, and Parasitology sections.

To determine whether one or more course grades were predictive of success on the MLT/ASCP, correlations between graduates' scores on the MLT/ASCP and their course grades were computed. The following subject correlated at a significant level ($P > .001$) with the MLT/ASCP:

Microbiology I.

A high grade in Microbiology I was predictive of success in the MLT/ASCP for responding graduates of the Medical Laboratory department. It is suggested that the relatively small number of respondents who indicated they attempted the MLT/ASCP be considered before any firm conclusions be drawn from these results.

Table MC-1

Graduates' scores on MLT/ASCP
Certification Examination

60	80	85	97	101	Total
1	1	1	1	1	5

Mean Score	84.60
Standard Deviation	16.19
Median Score	86.75

Table MC-2

MLT/ASCP Certification
Examination year

	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	Total
Number	1	0	2	1	7	3	2	16
% of respondents	6.3	0.0	12.5	6.3	43.8	18.8	12.5	100.0

Table MC-3

Graduates' report of other
examinations attempted

Examination	Number	Percentage
Medical Tech/ASCP	15	16.9
N.Y.C. Dept. of Health/ Medical Technologist	17	19.1
N.Y.C. Dept. of Health/ Medical Technician	6	6.7
None	51	57.3

Table MC-4

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for the Microbiology section of the MLT/ASCP Certification Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Clinical Lab Science I (Hematology)	Number	7	7	2	1	5	5
	% of dept.	31.8	31.8	9.1	4.5	22.7	
Microbiology I	Number	15	5	0	2	0	3
	% of dept.	68.2	22.7	0.0	9.1	0.0	
Clinical Lab Science II (Cl. Chem.)	Number	8	6	3	0	5	4
	% of dept.	36.4	27.3	13.6	0.0	22.7	
Histology	Number	6	3	6	0	5	6
	% of dept.	30.0	15.0	30.0	0.0	25.0	
Microbiology II	Number	18	3	0	0	1	2
	% of dept.	81.8	13.6	0.0	0.0	4.5	
Clinical Lab Practice (Hospital)	Number	16	5	0	0	0	1
	% of dept.	76.2	23.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	

Table MC-5

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for the Serology section of the MLT/ASCP Certification Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Clinical Lab Science I (Hematology)	Number	9	6	3	0	1	2
	% of dept.	47.4	31.6	15.8	0.0	5.3	
Microbiology I	Number	5	8	3	1	2	4
	% of dept.	26.3	42.1	15.8	5.3	10.5	
Clinical Lab Science II (Cl. Chem.)	Number	5	4	2	0	7	6
	% of dept.	27.8	22.2	11.1	0.0	38.9	
Histology	Number	3	2	7	0	7	5
	% of dept.	15.8	10.5	36.8	0.0	36.8	
Microbiology II	Number	6	10	1	0	2	3
	% of dept.	31.6	52.6	5.3	0.0	10.5	
Clinical Lab Practice (Hospital)	Number	12	3	2	0	1	1
	% of dept.	66.7	16.7	11.1	0.0	5.6	

Table MC-6

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for the Clinical Chemistry section of the MLT/ASCP Certification Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Clinical Lab Science I (Hematology)	Number	8	4	3	0	5	3
	% of dept.	40.0	20.0	15.0	0.0	25.0	
Microbiology I	Number	3	3	6	0	8	5
	% of dept.	15.0	15.0	30.0	0.0	40.0	
Clinical Lab Science II (Cl. Chem.)	Number	14	4	0	1	0	2
	% of dept.	73.7	21.1	0.0	5.3	0.0	
Histology	Number	3	2	6	0	9	6
	% of dept.	15.0	10.0	30.0	0.0	45.0	
Microbiology II	Number	4	3	5	0	8	4
	% of dept.	20.0	15.0	25.0	0.0	40.0	
Clinical Lab Practice (Hospital)	Number	15	4	0	0	0	1
	% of dept.	78.9	21.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	

Table MC-7

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for the Hematology section of the MLT/ASCP Certification Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Clinical Lab Science I (Hematology)	Number	16	4	1	0	0	1
	% of dept.	76.2	19.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	
Microbiology I	Number	5	3	2	0	7	6
	% of dept.	23.8	14.3	28.6	0.0	33.3	
Clinical Lab Science II (Cl. Chem.)	Number	8	3	3	0	6	3
	% of dept.	40.0	15.0	15.0	0.0	30.0	
Histology	Number	7	4	4	0	6	4
	% of dept.	33.3	19.0	19.0	0.0	28.6	
Microbiology II	Number	5	4	5	0	7	5
	% of dept.	23.8	19.0	23.8	0.0	33.3	
Clinical Lab Practice (Hospital)	Number	14	4	0	0	1	2
	% of dept.	73.7	21.1	0.0	0.0	5.3	

Table MC-8

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for the Urinalysis section of the MLT/ASCP Certification Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Clinical Lab Science I (Hematology)	Number	11	6	2	1	1	2
	% of dept.	52.4	28.6	9.5	4.8	4.8	
Microbiology I	Number	4	5	3	1	6	6
	% of dept.	21.1	26.3	15.8	5.3	31.6	
Clinical Lab Science II (Cl. Chem.)	Number	6	7	1	0	5	3
	% of dept.	31.6	36.8	5.3	0.0	26.3	
Histology	Number	4	4	6	0	5	5
	% of dept.	21.1	21.1	31.6	0.0	26.3	
Microbiology II	Number	4	6	4	0	5	4
	% of dept.	21.1	31.6	21.1	0.0	26.3	
Clinical Lab Practice (Hospital)	Number	14	3	1	0	1	1
	% of dept.	73.7	15.8	5.3	0.0	5.3	

Table MC-9

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for the Blood Banking section of the MLT/ASCP Certification Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Clinical Lab Science I (Hematology)	Number	8	8	2	1	0	2
	% of dept.	42.1	42.1	10.5	5.3	0.0	
Microbiology I	Number	2	3	4	0	9	4.5
	% of dept.	11.1	16.7	22.2	0.0	50.0	
Clinical Lab Science II (Cl. Chem.)	Number	4	3	3	0	8	3
	% of dept.	22.2	16.7	16.7	0.0	44.4	
Histology	Number	2	1	6	0	9	6
	% of dept.	11.1	5.6	33.3	0.0	50.0	
Microbiology II	Number	2	3	4	0	9	4.5
	% of dept.	11.1	16.7	22.2	0.0	50.0	
Clinical Lab Practice (Hospital)	Number	14	3	0	0	1	1
	% of dept.	77.8	16.7	0.0	0.0	5.6	

Table MC-10

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for the Parasitology section of the MLT/ASCP Certification Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Clinical Lab Science I (Hematology)	Number	3	5	3	0	7	4
	% of dept.	16.7	27.8	16.7	0.0	38.9	
Microbiology I	Number	5	4	5	0	4	3
	% of dept.	27.8	22.2	27.8	0.0	22.2	
Clinical Lab Science II (Cl. Chem.)	Number	3	2	4	0	9	6
	% of dept.	16.7	11.1	22.2	0.0	50.0	
Histology	Number	2	5	3	0	7	5
	% of dept.	11.8	29.4	17.6	0.0	41.2	
Microbiology II	Number	6	5	4	0	3	2
	% of dept.	33.3	27.8	22.2	0.0	16.7	
Clinical Lab Practice (Hospital)	Number	11	3	1	0	2	1
	% of dept.	64.7	17.6	5.9	0.0	11.8	

Table MC-11

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for actual employment conditions

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Clinical Lab Science I (Hematology)	Number	20	13	2	0	1	3
	% of dept.	55.6	36.1	5.6	0.0	2.5	
Microbiology I	Number	15	19	2	1	0	5
	% of dept.	40.5	51.4	5.4	2.7	0.0	
Clinical Lab Science II (Cl. Chem.)	Number	20	12	2	0	2	4
	% of dept.	55.6	33.3	5.6	0.0	5.6	
Histology	Number	8	16	10	0	1	6
	% of dept.	22.9	45.7	28.6	0.0	2.9	
Microbiology II	Number	18	16	0	0	1	2
	% of dept.	51.4	45.7	0.0	0.0	2.9	
Clinical Lab Practice (Hospital)	Number	26	6	1	0	1	1
	% of dept.	76.5	17.6	2.9	0.0	2.9	

Table MC-12

Graduates' grades for selected
Career Learning courses

Course		A	B	C	D	Other	Mean Grade* Standard Deviation
Biology	Number	13	17	19	1	39	2.840
	Percent	14.6	19.1	21.3	1.1	43.8	0.842
General Chemistry I	Number	8	14	27	2	38	2.549
	Percent	9.0	15.7	30.3	2.2	42.7	0.808
General Chemistry 2	Number	6	12	16	14	41	2.208
	Percent	6.7	13.5	18.0	15.7	46.1	1.010
Anatomy and Physiology	Number	5	3	9	0	72	2.611
	Percent	5.6	3.4	10.1	0.0	80.9	1.092
Microbio- logy 1	Number	13	18	19	1	38	2.843
	Percent	14.6	20.2	21.3	1.1	42.7	0.834
Microbio- logy 2	Number	17	20	7	2	43	3.130
	Percent	19.1	22.5	7.9	2.2	48.3	0.833
Histology	Number	9	28	11	2	39	2.880
	Percent	10.1	31.5	12.4	2.2	43.8	0.746
Clinical Lab Science 1	Number	13	15	17	3	41	2.792
	Percent	14.6	16.9	19.1	3.4	46.1	0.922
Clinical Lab Science 2	Number	8	14	24	0	43	2.652
	Percent	9.0	15.7	27.0	0.0	48.3	0.766

Based on: A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1

166

(continued next page)

Course		A	B	C	D	Other	Mean Grade* Standard Deviation
Physiology	Number	4	9	14	2	60	2.517
	Percent	4.5	10.1	15.7	2.2	67.4	0.829
Fundamentals of Math	Number	5	3	3	1	77	3.000
	Percent	5.6	3.4	3.4	1.1	86.5	1.044
Math Analysis 1	Number	10	9	14	10	46	2.442
	Percent	11.2	10.1	15.7	11.2	51.7	1.098
Math Analysis 2	Number	3	6	8	9	63	2.037
	Percent	3.4	6.7	9.0	10.1	70.8	1.091
English Composition	Number	12	15	17	1	44	2.844
	Percent	13.5	16.9	19.1	1.1	49.4	0.852

*Based on: A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1

Table MC-13

Graduates' perception of course component as best preparation for each section of MLT/ASCP Certification Examination

Section		Labs	Reading Material	Written Assignments	Exams	Review Seminars	Lectures	Discussions
Microbiology	Number	5	3	2	3	0	6	1
	% of dept.	25.0	15.0	10.0	15.0	0.0	30.0	5.0
Serology	Number	0	6	3	1	2	2	0
	% of dept.	0.0	42.9	21.4	7.1	14.3	14.3	0.0
Clinical Chemistry	Number	6	3	1	1	1	4	2
	% of dept.	33.3	16.7	5.6	5.6	5.6	22.2	11.1
Hematology	Number	4	3	2	2	1	6	0
	% of dept.	22.2	16.7	11.1	11.1	5.6	33.3	0.0
Urinalysis	Number	6	4	1	2	1	2	2
	% of dept.	33.3	22.2	5.6	11.1	5.6	11.1	11.1
Blood Banking	Number	3	9	0	1	1	1	0
	% of dept.	20.0	60.0	0.0	6.7	6.7	6.7	0.0
Parasitology	Number	1	9	0	1	2	2	0
	% of dept.	6.7	60.0	0.0	6.7	13.3	13.3	0.0

Table MC-14

Graduates' perception of Career Learning instructors' help as preparation for each section of MLT/ASCP Certification Examination

Section		Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Microbiology	Number	17	5	1	0	0
	% of dept.	73.9	21.7	4.3	0.0	0.0
Serology	Number	2	5	4	3	5
	% of dept.	10.5	26.3	21.1	15.8	26.3
Clinical Chemistry	Number	9	7	4	0	2
	% of dept.	40.9	31.8	18.2	0.0	9.1
Hematology	Number	7	10	3	0	2
	% of dept.	31.8	45.5	13.6	0.0	9.1
Urinalysis	Number	3	11	3	0	5
	% of dept.	13.6	50.0	13.6	0.0	22.7
Blood Banking	Number	2	6	3	3	7
	% of dept.	9.5	28.6	14.3	14.3	33.3
Parasitology	Number	1	2	5	2	6
	% of dept.	6.3	12.5	31.3	12.5	37.5

Graduates' perception of teaching strategy as best preparation for each section of MLT/ASCP Certification Examination

Section		Subject matter stressed	Presentation of material	Response to questions	Teachers' comments	Individual assistance	Teaching aids
Microbiology	Number	6	9	0	1	0	2
	% of dept.	33.3	50.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	11.1
Serology	Number	1	4	1	0	2	2
	% of dept.	10.0	40.0	10.0	0.0	20.0	20.0
Clinical Chemistry	Number	6	3	2	3	2	1
	% of dept.	35.3	17.6	11.8	17.6	11.8	5.9
Hematology	Number	7	3	2	2	1	0
	% of dept.	46.7	20.0	13.3	13.3	6.7	0.0
Urinalysis	Number	1	5	2	1	1	0
	% of dept.	7.7	38.5	15.4	7.7	7.7	0.0
Blood Banking	Number	3	2	1	0	1	3
	% of dept.	30.0	20.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	30.0
Parasitology	Number	2	0	2	0	3	3
	% of dept.	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	30.0	30.0

Table MC-16

Graduates' perception of N.Y.C.C.C.
curriculum as preparation for the
MLT/ASCP Certification Examination

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Total
Number	2	6	6	4	2	20
Percent	10.0	30.0	30.0	20.0	10.0	100.0

Table MC-17

Graduates' perception of N.Y.C.C.C.
curriculum as preparation for each section
of MLT/ASCP Certification Examination

Section		Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very Poor
Microbiology	Number	10	6	3	1	1
	% of dept.	47.6	28.6	14.3	4.8	4.8
Serology	Number	3	1	2	8	2
	% of dept.	18.8	6.3	12.5	50.0	12.5
Clinical Chemistry	Number	4	8	5	3	0
	% of dept.	20.0	40.0	25.0	15.0	0.0
Hematology	Number	7	6	3	2	0
	% of dept.	38.9	33.3	16.7	11.1	0.0
Urinalysis	Number	4	2	6	5	1
	% of dept.	22.2	11.1	33.3	27.8	5.6
Blood Banking	Number	1	1	6	3	6
	% of dept.	5.9	5.9	35.3	17.6	35.3
Parasitology	Number	0	3	4	4	4
	% of dept.	0.0	20.0	26.7	26.7	26.7

Nursing Licensure Section

One of the significant milestones in a nursing career is the New York State Board Licensure Examination (NYSBLE). This examination consists of 5 sections:

- Medical
- Surgical
- Obstetrics
- Pediatrics
- Psychiatry.

To practice nursing as a professional in New York State an applicant must receive a passing score on the examination.

To evaluate the success of N.Y.C.C.C. graduates on the NYSBLE and their perception of the value of components of their N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum as preparation for the NYSBLE, this section of the division evaluation was prepared. Two hundred seventy-one Nursing department graduates responded to the questionnaire mailed to all graduates; 255 respondents (94.1%) indicated they attempted the NYSBLE. The data herein is representative of these respondents.

Table NC-1 provides data describing the actual scores obtained by graduates of N.Y.C.C.C. on the NYSBLE, and Table NC-2 provides selected statistics based on the actual scores in order to properly analyze the data presented. It can be seen in Table NC-2 that the variation in mean score obtained for each section and for each repeat section was relatively small: approximately 5.6% for all sections and approximately 14% for all repeat sections. Graduates, therefore, are not scoring widely differently on the various sections of the NYSBLE, although the differences between the lowest mean (Surgical section) and the other four means are all significant at the .01 level.

Much more apparent, however, is the wide range of individual scores obtained in the various sections. From Table NC-1 it can be seen that there were 20 scores below 300 on the Pediatrics section. From Table NC-2 it can be seen that the lowest score on the Pediatrics section was 24 and the highest score 698. The range is unusually high, particularly for a certification examination.

It can also be noted in Table NC-2 that the greatest range of scores (690) was for the Surgical section; the lowest range of scores (520) was for the Obstetrics section. This would indicate that there is considerably less difference in level of preparation in Obstetrics among the graduates of the Nursing Department than there is in the level of preparation for other sections.

It will be noted in Tables NC-1 and NC-2 that mean scores for the five repeat sections of NYSBLE all tend to be significantly lower than the first attempt scores. It should also be noted, however, that the minimum scores for each repeat section are considerably higher (except in the Obstetrics section) than the first attempt minimum scores. Although the mean of the Psychiatry section is not the highest mean of the repeat section means, the highest maximum score and median were both on the Psychiatry section.

Tables NC-3 and NC-4 provide data showing the number of attempts necessary to pass NYSBLE and the years in which graduates took the examinations. It can be seen in Table NC-3 that 43.1% of Nursing Departments required two or more attempts to pass NYSBLE, and 2.7% have not passed at the time of responding. It is evident from Table NC-4 that the largest number of respondents attempted NYSBLE the first time in 1973; the same year the largest number of respondents made their second attempt to pass.

Tables NC-5 through NC-9 contain Nursing Department graduates' perception of the value of specific courses, in their curriculum at N.Y.C.C.C., as preparation for each section of NYSBLE. It is evident from Table NC-5 that the graduates perceive Anatomy and Physiology I to be the most valuable course and Maternal Health the second most valuable course as preparation for the Medical section of NYSBLE. It is also apparent that Psychology of Adolescence and Anatomy and Physiology II were perceived to be the least valuable course and second least valuable course,

respectively, as preparation for the Medical section of NYSBLE.

Data in Table NC-6 show graduates to perceive Anatomy and Physiology I and Psychiatric Nursing to be the most valuable course and second most valuable course, respectively, as preparation for the Surgical section of NYSBLE. Psychology of Adolescence and Maternal Health were perceived to be the least valuable course and second least valuable course, respectively, as preparation for the Surgical section. Table NC-7 referencing the Obstetrics section of NYSBLE shows graduates' perception of the most valuable course and second most valuable course as preparation was Maternal Health and Anatomy and Physiology I respectively. The least valuable course and second least valuable course as preparation for the same section was Psychology of Adolescence and Child Psychology, respectively.

The relative value of courses as preparation for the Pediatrics section of NYSBLE is provided in Table NC-8. Child Psychology and Anatomy and Physiology I were perceived to be the most valuable course and second most valuable course respectively, and Anatomy and Physiology II and Microbiology were perceived to be the least valuable course and second least valuable course, respectively, as preparation for this section. Table NC-9 indicates that Nursing Department graduates perceived Psychiatric Nursing and Child Psychology to be the most valuable course and second most valuable course, respectively, as preparation for the Psychiatry section of NYSBLE. The graduates also perceived Microbiology

and Anatomy and Physiology II to be the least valuable course and second least valuable course, respectively, as preparation for the same section.

Table NC-10 extends the same course by course ratings to Nursing Department graduates' perception of value as preparation for actual job conditions. It can be seen in this table that graduates perceived Psychiatric Nursing and Introduction to Psychology as the most valuable course and second most valuable course, respectively, and Anatomy and Physiology II and Microbiology as the least valuable course and second least valuable course respectively, as preparation for their actual health service employment. It should be noted that Anatomy and Physiology II is rather consistently perceived as one of the least most valuable courses as preparation for the various sections of NYSBLE and actual employment.

Table NC-11 provides course grades of graduates of the Nursing Department for selected Career Learning courses. It can be seen that the mean grade varies from 2.506 (Anatomy and Physiology) to 2.944 (Developmental Psychology), a difference that is statistically significant to a level of .0001. There is undoubtedly a relationship between the significantly lower mean grade received for Anatomy and Physiology and the consistency of low ratings for value given Anatomy and Physiology II by graduates. It should also be noted that although one of the strongest, most often repeated criticisms expressed by faculty (see Faculty Analysis Section, page 7) was the inability of students to read and/or communicate,

the mean score for English Composition was one of the highest listed.

Graduates' perception of the course component that was the best preparation for each section of NYSBLE is provided in Table NC-12. It can be seen that the highest percentage of Nursing Department graduates perceive reading material to be the best preparation for the Medical section of NYSBLE; lectures to be the best preparation for the Surgical section, the Obstetrics section, and the Pediatrics section; discussions to be the best preparation for the Psychiatry section.

Tables NC-13 and NC-14 present Nursing Department graduates' perception of their Career Learning instructors and teaching strategies as preparation for the various sections of NYSBLE. It can be determined from Table NC-13 that the majority of graduates perceived their instructors' efforts to be excellent or very good as help in preparing for all sections of NYSBLE. Instructors' help was rated highest for the Medical section, lowest for the Pediatrics section. Table NC-14 shows the graduates' perceptions of teaching strategies most helpful as preparation for NYSBLE. It can be seen that for every section, subject matter stressed by the instructor was considered most helpful as preparation for the section, and the method of presentation of material the second most helpful strategy. Teaching aids were perceived to be least helpful as preparation for the various sections of NYSBLE.

Tables NC-15 and NC-16 provide Nursing Department graduates' perceptions of their N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum as preparation for NYSBLE and for each

section of NYSBLE. It can be seen in Table NC-15 that 80.4% of graduates perceive their training at N.Y.C.C.C. to be good, very good, or excellent preparation for NYSBLE and only 5.8% perceive their training to be poor preparation for the examination. When analyzed by NYSBLE section, several interesting observations can be made. Although the smallest percentage of graduates (15.9%) perceive their N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum to be excellent preparation for the Medical section of NYSBLE, the smallest percentage (6.9%) also perceive it to be poor or very poor preparation for the same section. The largest percentage of graduates (30.8%) perceive their N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum to be excellent preparation for the Psychiatry section of NYSBLE, but the largest percentage (13.5%) also perceive it to be poor or very poor preparation for the same section. This apparent anomaly is undoubtedly related to the variation in range of scores received in the sections of NYSBLE, as shown in Table NC-2. It will be recalled that the greatest range, as well as the highest mean score, was in the Psychiatry section. Overall analysis of Table NC-16 indicates that although there is a slight deviation in perceived quality of the N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum from that shown in Table NC-15, the mean perception of N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum is adequate to good with approximately 90% of Nursing Department graduates perceiving their curriculum as adequate, good, or excellent preparation for NYSBLE.

To determine whether one or more course grades were predictive of success on the various sections of NYSBLE, correlations between graduates' scores on each section of NYSBLE and their course grades were computed.

The following subjects, listed in decreasing order of significance, correlated at a significant level ($P > .001$) with all sections of NYSBLE:

P and M Illness I

Childhood Health

Maternal Health

Microbiology

Fundamentals of Nursing

Anatomy and Physiology

P and M Illness II

Principles of Chemistry and Biology.

A high grade in P and M Illness I was most predictive of a high grade in all sections of NYSBLE, for the responding Nursing department graduates, than any other single factor analyzed in this study. It is suggested that the structure, content, and evaluation techniques of this course be thoroughly examined and used as a model for those courses not providing content or evaluation consistent with needs and requirements of students.

Table NC-1

Graduates' scores on sections of the
N.Y.S. Board Licensure Examination

Section		Less than 300	300-350	351-400	401-450	451-500	501-550	551-600	601-650	651-700	701-750	Total
Medical	Number	26	19	31	29	28	27	12	9	8	1	190
	Percent	13.7	10.0	16.3	15.3	14.7	14.2	6.3	4.7	4.2	0.5	100.0
Surgical	Number	31	24	30	38	26	13	16	5	4	3	190
	Percent	16.3	12.6	15.8	20.0	13.7	6.8	8.4	2.6	2.1	1.6	100.0
Obstetrics	Number	23	27	35	26	27	20	18	6	6	0	188
	Percent	12.2	14.4	18.6	13.8	14.4	10.6	9.6	3.2	3.2	0.0	100.0
Pediatrics	Number	20	27	28	26	31	19	15	9	6	0	181
	Percent	11.0	14.9	15.5	14.4	17.1	10.5	8.3	4.9	3.3	0.0	100.0
Psychiatry	Number	23	16	37	21	30	23	14	10	3	3	180
	Percent	12.8	8.9	20.6	11.7	16.6	12.8	7.8	5.6	1.7	1.7	100.0
Medical Repeat	Number	6	5	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
	Percent	37.5	31.3	12.5	18.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Surgical Repeat	Number	8	8	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
	Percent	30.8	30.8	23.1	15.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Obstetrics Repeat	Number	5	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
	Percent	29.4	23.5	23.5	23.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Pediatrics Repeat	Number	6	4	6	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	23
	Percent	26.1	17.4	26.1	21.7	8.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Psychology Repeat	Number	7	2	6	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	19
	Percent	36.8	10.5	31.6	10.5	5.3	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Table NC-2

Selected statistics for each section of
the New York State Board Licensure Examination

Section	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum Score	Maximum Score	Median
Medical	430.624	123.914	91	709	436.63
Surgical	408.526	130.588	33	723	408.50
Obstetrics	428.377	111.531	171	691	423.00
Pediatrics	430.569	116.123	24	698	433.75
Psychiatry	436.366	120.770	73	750	442.50
Medical Repeat	304.438	97.694	121	443	321.50
Surgical Repeat	326.154	79.818	141	441	343.00
Obstetrics Repeat	325.588	93.943	102	445	342.00
Pediatrics Repeat	349.522	77.707	221	493	355.00
Psychiatry Repeat	328.947	103.260	112	521	367.00

Table NC-3

Graduates' report of number of attempts
required to pass N.Y.S. Board Licensure
Examination

	1	2	3	4	5	more than 5	did not pass	total
Number	148	69	27	3	5	1	7	260
% of respondents	56.9	26.5	10.4	1.2	1.9	0.4	2.7	100.0

Table NC-4

N.Y.S. Board Licensure Examination
year by attempt

Year	1st attempt	2nd attempt	3rd attempt	4th attempt
1968	10			
1969	24			
1970	32	2		
1971	43	4	1	
1972	50	3	1	
1973	63	9	2	
1974	36	5	2	
1975	1	4	2	2

Table NC-5

Graduates' perception of the value of
specific courses as preparation for the
Medical section of the N.Y.S. Board
Licensure Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not Apply	Rating
Fundamentals of Nursing	Number	124	107	9	1	11	3
	% of dept.	49.2	42.5	3.6	0.4	4.4	
Microbiology	Number	66	148	27	4	2	9
	% of dept.	26.6	59.7	10.9	1.6	0.8	
Intro. to Psychology	Number	105	105	27	3	5	6
	% of dept.	42.9	42.9	11.0	1.2	2.0	
Maternal Health	Number	100	99	17	1	25	11
	% of dept.	41.3	40.9	7.0	0.4	10.3	
Psychiatric Nursing	Number	139	92	12	1	3	2
	% of dept.	56.3	37.2	4.9	0.4	1.2	
Anatomy and Physiology I	Number	142	101	6	0	4	1
	% of dept.	56.1	39.9	2.4	0.0	1.6	
Child Psychology	Number	87	117	20	2	15	10
	% of dept.	36.1	48.5	8.3	0.8	6.2	
Adult and Child Nursing I	Number	112	111	3	0	14	4
	% of dept.	46.7	46.3	1.3	0.0	5.8	
Adult and Child Nursing II	Number	110	106	2	0	15	5
	% of dept.	47.2	45.5	0.9	0.0	6.4	
Anatomy and Physiology II	Number	102	90	4	0	35	12
	% of dept.	44.2	39.0	1.7	0.0	15.2	
Psychology of Adolescence	Number	78	96	15	1	38	13
	% of dept.	34.2	42.1	6.6	0.4	16.7	
Adult and Child Nursing III	Number	107	104	1	0	19	7
	% of dept.	39.5	38.4	0.4	0.0	8.2	
Adult and Child Nursing IV	Number	107	103	2	0	20	8
	% of dept.	39.5	38.0	0.7	0.0	7.4	

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for the Surgical section of the N.Y.S. Board Licensure Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not Apply	Rating
Fundamentals of Nursing	Number	117	108	10	1	9	3
	% of dept.	47.8	44.1	4.1	0.4	3.7	
Microbiology	Number	91	120	23	4	7	8
	% of dept.	37.0	48.8	9.3	1.6	2.8	
Intro. to Psychology	Number	80	121	25	4	12	9
	% of dept.	33.1	50.0	10.3	1.7	5.0	
Maternal Health	Number	58	119	26	1	33	12
	% of dept.	24.5	50.2	11.0	0.4	13.9	
Psychiatric Nursing	Number	123	97	16	1	7	2
	% of dept.	50.4	39.8	6.6	0.4	2.9	
Anatomy and Physiology I	Number	150	95	2	2	2	1
	% of dept.	59.8	37.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	
Child Psychology	Number	65	122	26	3	22	11
	% of dept.	27.3	51.3	10.8	1.3	9.2	
Adult and Child Nursing I	Number	102	118	5	0	13	4
	% of dept.	42.9	49.6	2.1	0.0	5.5	
Adult and Child Nursing II	Number	96	117	3	1	15	7
	% of dept.	41.0	50.0	1.3	0.4	6.4	
Anatomy and Physiology II	Number	114	76	0	0	36	10
	% of dept.	50.4	33.6	0.0	0.0	15.9	
Psychology of Adolescence	Number	64	96	21	0	45	13
	% of dept.	28.3	42.5	9.3	0.0	19.9	
Adult and Child Nursing III	Number	102	105	3	0	19	5
	% of dept.	44.5	45.9	1.3	0.0	8.3	
Adult and Child Nursing IV	Number	101	103	4	0	19	6
	% of dept.	44.5	45.4	1.8	0.0	8.4	

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for the Obstetrics section of the N.Y.S. Board Licensure Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not Apply	Rating
Fundamentals of Nursing	Number	92	112	15	2	15	4
	% of dept.	39.0	47.5	6.4	0.8	6.4	
Microbiology	Number	50	121	38	3	19	11
	% of dept.	21.6	52.4	16.5	1.3	8.2	
Intro. to Psychology	Number	91	102	18	2	15	5
	% of dept.	39.9	44.7	7.9	0.9	6.6	
Maternal Health	Number	177	61	1	0	3	1
	% of dept.	73.1	25.2	0.4	0.0	1.2	
Psychiatric Nursing	Number	122	95	8	1	8	3
	% of dept.	52.1	40.6	3.4	0.4	3.4	
Anatomy and Physiology I	Number	135	98	5	0	2	2
	% of dept.	56.3	40.8	2.1	0.0	0.8	
Child Psychology	Number	56	97	30	2	35	12
	% of dept.	25.5	44.1	13.6	0.9	15.9	
Adult and Child Nursing I	Number	89	101	9	0	21	6
	% of dept.	40.5	45.9	4.1	0.0	9.5	
Adult and Child Nursing II	Number	84	103	9	0	25	7
	% of dept.	38.0	46.6	4.1	0.0	11.3	
Anatomy and Physiology II	Number	102	72	9	0	35	8
	% of dept.	46.8	33.0	4.1	0.0	16.1	
Psychology of Adolescence	Number	53	92	22	2	46	13
	% of dept.	24.7	42.8	10.2	0.9	21.4	
Adult and Child Nursing III	Number	82	99	10	0	29	9
	% of dept.	37.3	45.0	4.5	0.0	13.2	
Adult and Child Nursing IV	Number	78	104	9	0	29	10
	% of dept.	35.5	47.3	4.1	0.0	13.2	

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for the Pediatrics section of the N.Y.S. Board Licensure Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not Apply	Rating
Fundamentals of Nursing	Number	98	101	16	2	15	9
	% of dept.	42.2	43.5	6.9	0.9	6.5	
Microbiology	Number	64	109	37	4	16	12
	% of dept.	27.7	47.2	16.0	1.7	6.9	
Intro. to Psychology	Number	107	104	11	2	9	5
	% of dept.	45.9	44.6	4.7	0.9	3.9	
Maternal Health	Number	85	117	14	1	15	10
	% of dept.	36.6	50.4	6.0	0.4	6.5	
Psychiatric Nursing	Number	122	97	11	1	5	3
	% of dept.	51.7	41.1	4.7	0.4	2.1	
Anatomy and Physiology I	Number	118	103	6	0	6	2
	% of dept.	50.6	44.2	2.6	0.0	2.6	
Child Psychology	Number	174	60	2	0	2	1
	% of dept.	73.1	25.2	0.8	0.0	0.8	
Adult and Child Nursing I	Number	120	101	2	0	9	4
	% of dept.	51.7	43.5	0.9	0.0	3.9	
Adult and Child Nursing II	Number	108	98	2	0	17	6
	% of dept.	48.0	43.6	0.9	0.0	7.6	
Anatomy and Physiology II	Number	83	90	6	1	38	13
	% of dept.	38.1	41.3	2.8	0.5	17.4	
Psychology of Adolescence	Number	106	83	7	0	26	11
	% of dept.	47.7	37.4	3.2	0.0	11.7	
Adult and Child Nursing III	Number	105	95	3	0	21	8
	% of dept.	46.9	42.4	1.3	0.0	9.4	
Adult and Child Nursing IV	Number	102	94	2	0	20	7
	% of dept.	46.8	43.1	0.9	0.0	9.2	

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for the Psychiatry section of the N.Y.S. Board Licensure Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not Apply	Rating
Fundamentals of Nursing	Number	65	92	42	5	27	9
	% of dept.	28.1	39.8	18.2	2.2	11.7	
Microbiology	Number	21	66	78	14	51	13
	% of dept.	9.1	28.6	33.8	6.1	22.1	
Intro. to Psychology	Number	143	91	6	2	2	3
	% of dept.	58.6	37.3	2.5	0.8	0.8	
Maternal Health	Number	53	104	32	3	35	11
	% of dept.	23.3	45.8	14.1	1.3	15.4	
Psychiatric Nursing	Number	182	59	3	3	1	1
	% of dept.	73.4	23.8	1.2	1.2	0.4	
Anatomy and Physiology I	Number	68	102	34	3	28	10
	% of dept.	28.9	43.4	14.5	1.3	11.9	
Child Psychology	Number	150	82	4	0	6	2
	% of dept.	62.0	33.9	1.7	0.0	2.5	
Adult and Child Nursing I	Number	64	124	11	2	22	5
	% of dept.	28.7	55.6	4.9	0.9	9.9	
Adult and Child Nursing II	Number	60	124	10	2	26	6
	% of dept.	27.0	55.9	4.5	0.9	11.7	
Anatomy and Physiology II	Number	53	89	25	2	54	12
	% of dept.	23.8	39.5	11.2	0.9	24.2	
Psychology of Adolescence	Number	130	77	3	1	25	4
	% of dept.	55.1	32.6	1.3	0.4	10.6	
Adult and Child Nursing III	Number	64	118	9	2	30	7
	% of dept.	28.7	52.9	4.0	0.9	13.5	
Adult and Child Nursing IV	Number	63	117	11	2	30	8
	% of dept.	28.3	52.5	4.9	0.9	13.5	

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for actual employment conditions

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not Apply	Rating
Fundamentals of Nursing	Number	128	96	6	3	12	5
	% of dept.	52.5	39.2	2.4	1.2	4.9	
Microbiology	Number	82	122	25	6	9	12
	% of dept.	33.6	50.0	10.2	2.5	3.7	
Intro. to Psychology	Number	138	100	8	1	2	2
	% of dept.	55.4	40.2	3.2	0.4	0.8	
Maternal Health	Number	115	118	3	0	11	6
	% of dept.	46.6	47.8	1.2	0.0	4.5	
Psychiatric Nursing	Number	160	79	5	1	6	1
	% of dept.	63.7	31.5	2.0	0.4	2.4	
Anatomy and Physiology I	Number	134	100	6	0	7	4
	% of dept.	54.3	40.5	2.4	0.0	2.8	
Child Psychology	Number	133	108	3	0	7	3
	% of dept.	53.0	43.0	1.2	0.0	2.8	
Adult and Child Nursing I	Number	119	102	1	0	15	7
	% of dept.	50.2	43.0	0.4	0.0	6.3	
Adult and Child Nursing II	Number	111	102	1	0	19	8
	% of dept.	47.6	43.8	0.4	0.0	8.2	
Anatomy and Physiology II	Number	91	91	3	0	35	13
	% of dept.	41.4	41.4	1.4	0.0	15.9	
Psychology of Adolescence	Number	118	89	4	0	22	9
	% of dept.	50.6	38.2	1.7	0.0	9.4	
Adult and Child Nursing III	Number	109	95	1	0	22	11
	% of dept.	48.0	41.9	0.4	0.0	9.7	
Adult and Child Nursing IV	Number	109	97	1	0	21	10
	% of dept.	47.8	42.5	0.4	0.0	9.2	

Graduates' grades for selected
Career Learning courses

Courses		A	B	C	D	Other	Mean grade*
							Standard deviation
Fundamentals of Nursing	Number	25	90	75	10	71	2.650
	% of dept.	9.2	33.2	27.7	3.7	26.2	0.762
Microbiology	Number	46	89	88	14	34	2.705
	% of dept.	17.0	32.8	32.5	5.2	12.5	0.847
Intro. to Psychology	Number	66	59	83	13	50	2.805
	% of dept.	24.4	21.8	30.6	4.8	18.5	0.936
Maternal Health	Number	27	112	76	9	47	2.701
	% of dept.	10.0	41.3	28.0	3.3	17.3	0.730
Developmental Psychology	Number	75	78	74	7	37	2.944
	% of dept.	27.7	28.8	27.3	2.6	13.7	0.870
Anatomy and Physiology	Number	43	71	80	39	38	2.506
	% of dept.	15.9	26.2	29.5	14.4	14.0	0.979
Childhood Health	Number	42	106	65	10	43	2.807
	% of dept.	15.5	39.1	24.0	3.7	17.7	0.790
P & M Illness I	Number	19	106	94	15	37	2.551
	% of dept.	7.0	39.1	34.7	5.5	13.7	0.735
P & M Illness II	Number	24	111	87	11	38	2.635
	% of dept.	8.9	41.0	32.1	4.1	14.0	0.731
P & M Illness III	Number	22	110	92	11	36	2.609
	% of dept.	8.1	40.6	33.9	4.1	13.3	0.722
P & M Illness IV	Number	32	115	84	5	35	2.737
	% of dept.	11.8	42.4	31.0	1.8	12.9	0.714
Principles of Chemistry and Biology	Number	39	80	81	33	38	2.536
	% of dept.	14.4	29.5	29.9	12.2	14.0	0.933
English Composition	Number	47	100	63	7	54	2.862
	% of dept.	17.3	36.9	23.2	2.6	19.9	0.787

Graduates' perception of course component
as best preparation for each section of
N.Y.S. Board Licensure Examination

Section		Labs	Reading material	Written assignments	Exams	Review seminars	Lectures	Discussions
Medical	Number	25	67	26	25	21	53	25
	% of dept.	10.3	27.7	10.7	10.3	8.7	21.9	10.3
Surgical	Number	17	51	20	25	34	80	16
	% of dept.	7.0	21.0	8.2	10.3	14.0	32.9	6.6
Obstetrics	Number	34	51	20	22	13	68	24
	% of dept.	14.7	22.0	8.6	9.5	5.6	29.3	10.3
Pediatrics	Number	22	70	14	19	12	75	27
	% of dept.	9.2	29.3	5.9	7.9	5.0	31.4	11.3
Psychiatry	Number	41	51	12	16	21	48	54
	% of dept.	16.9	21.0	4.9	6.6	8.6	19.8	22.2

Graduates' perception of Career Learning instructors' help as preparation for each section of N.Y.S. Board Licensure Examination

Section		Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Medical	Number	90	85	63	17	4
	% of dept.	34.7	32.8	24.3	6.6	1.5
Surgical	Number	97	67	63	24	8
	% of dept.	37.5	25.9	24.3	9.3	3.1
Obstetrics	Number	92	54	60	34	9
	% of dept.	36.9	21.7	24.1	13.7	3.6
Pediatrics	Number	84	67	62	30	10
	% of dept.	33.2	26.5	24.5	11.9	4.0
Psychiatry	Number	101	61	37	33	26
	% of dept.	39.1	23.6	14.3	12.8	10.1

Graduates' perception of teaching strategy
as best preparation for each section of
N.Y.S. Board Licensure Examination

Section		Subject matter stressed	Method of presentation of material	Response to questions	Teachers' comments	Individual assistance	Teaching aids
Medical	Number	98	66	17	27	8	13
	% of dept.	42.8	28.8	7.4	11.8	3.5	5.7
Surgical	Number	95	71	16	31	14	8
	% of dept.	40.4	30.2	6.8	13.2	6.0	3.4
Obstetrics	Number	74	69	17	39	10	11
	% of dept.	33.5	31.2	7.7	17.6	4.5	5.0
Pediatrics	Number	82	77	12	37	9	9
	% of dept.	36.3	34.1	5.3	16.4	4.0	4.0
Psychiatry	Number	80	66	20	40	15	9
	% of dept.	34.8	28.7	8.7	17.4	6.5	3.9

Table NC-15

Graduates' perception of N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum
as preparation for N.Y.S. Board Licensure
Examination

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Number	46	83	80	36	15
% of respondents	17.7	31.9	30.8	13.8	5.8

Graduates' perception of N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum as preparation for each section of N.Y.S. Board Licensure Examination

Section		Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very Poor
Medical	Number	39	98	91	14	3
	% of dept.	15.9	40.0	37.1	5.7	1.2
Surgical	Number	52	88	79	20	6
	% of dept.	21.2	35.9	32.2	8.2	2.4
Obstetrics	Number	63	80	69	21	6
	% of dept.	26.4	33.5	28.9	8.8	2.5
Pediatrics	Number	49	96	71	17	10
	% of dept.	20.2	39.5	29.2	7.0	4.1
Psychiatry	Number	73	70	62	20	10
	% of dept.	30.8	29.5	26.2	8.4	5.1

Ophthalmic Dispensary Licensure Section

To evaluate the success of New York City Community College (N.Y.C.C.C.) graduates of the Ophthalmic Dispensing department on the New York State Board for Ophthalmic Dispensary Licensure (NYSBODL) examination, and to measure their perception of the value of various components of their N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum as preparation for NYSBODL, this section of the division evaluation was prepared. Twenty-one Ophthalmic Dispensing graduates responded to the questionnaire mailed to all graduates; 20 respondents (95.2%) indicated they attempted the NYSBODL examination. The data herein is representative of these respondents.

Table OC-1 provides data describing the scores achieved by graduates of the Ophthalmic Dispensing department of N.Y.C.C.C. on the NYSBODL examination, and Table OC-2 provides selected statistics based on the actual scores obtained, in order to properly analyze the data presented. It can be seen in Table OC-1 that a wide variation exists in the number of graduates attempting each section, from a low of four graduates attempting Contact Lenses, Written and Contact Lenses, Oral Procedures sections to a high of thirteen attempting the Contact Lenses, Practical section. Table OC-2 shows the mean of graduates' scores of each section to be relatively similar, that is, within 12%. High and low scores for each section vary considerably, however. It can be seen in Table OC-2 that sections on which some graduates scored lowest are the same sections on which other graduates scored highest (e.g. Contact Lenses, Fitting), a situation which is confirmed by the unusually high standard deviation for those sections.

Tables OC-3 and OC-4 show the number of attempts reported necessary to pass the NYSBODL examination, and the year reported for first and second attempt. It can be seen in Table OC-3 that 60% of Ophthalmic Dispensing graduates reported passing NYSBODL on their first attempt; 10% did not pass at all. Table OC-4 indicates that 1971 and 1972 were the peak reported years for graduates to attempt the NYSBODL examination; six respondents attempted the examination in each year. 1969 was the earliest year of attempt reported by any respondent.

Table OC-5 lists the graduate respondents reporting an attempt to pass the American Board of Opticianary Certification Examination. It can be seen in the table that 7 graduates (33.3%) indicated they did attempt this examination.

Tables OC-6 through OC-15 contain Ophthalmic Dispensing department graduates' perception of the value of specific courses, in their curriculum at N.Y.C.C.C., as preparation for each section of NYSBODL. It can be seen in Table OC-6 that graduates perceived Principles of Optics I as the most valuable course as preparation for the Theoretical Optics section of NYSBODL and Contact Lenses II as the least valuable course as preparation for the same section.

Table OC-7 indicates that graduates perceive Anatomy and Physiology of the Eye and Ophthalmic Materials III to be the most valuable course and least valuable course, respectively, as preparation for the Anatomy/Physiology section of NYSBODL. The perceptions of graduates of the Ophthalmic Dispensing department indicate, as shown in Table OC-8, Ophthalmic Dispensing I to be the most valuable course as preparation for the Ophthalmic Dispensing section, and Contact Lenses II to be the least valuable course as preparation for the same section. Table OC-9 provides data relative to the Ophthalmic Materials section of NYSBODL. Graduates are shown to perceive Ophthalmic Materials I to be the most valuable course and Anatomy and Physiology of the Eye to be the least valuable course, respectively, as preparation for this section.

Table OC-10 indicates that graduates' perceptions of the most valuable course and least valuable course as preparation for the Ophthalmic Optics section are Principles of Optics II and Contact Lenses II, respectively. Ophthalmic Dispensing department graduates perceive Ophthalmic Dispensing I to be the most valuable course as preparation for the Practical Dispensing section and Contact Lenses II to be the least valuable course as preparation for the same section, as shown in Table OC-11. Table OC-12 showing graduates' perceptions of most valuable course as preparation for the Contact Lenses Written section is Contact Lenses I and the least valuable course as preparation for the same section is Ophthalmic Materials II.

Table OC-13 provides information indicating graduates of the Ophthalmic Dispensing department perceive the most valuable course as preparation for the Contact Lenses Oral Procedures section is Contact Lenses II, and the least valuable course as preparation for the same section is Ophthalmic Materials I. Table OC-14 shows graduates' perception of the most valuable course and least valuable course as preparation for the Contact Lenses Fitting section are Contact Lenses II and Ophthalmic Materials I, respectively. Graduates' perceptions of the most valuable course and least valuable course as preparation for the Contact Lenses Practical section are shown in Table OC-16. The courses are Contact Lenses I and Ophthalmic Materials II, respectively.

Table OC-16 extends the same course by course ratings to Ophthalmic

Dispensing department graduates' perception of value as preparation for actual employment conditions. It can be seen in this table that graduates perceive Ophthalmic Dispensing II to be the most valuable course and Special Visual Aids to be the least valuable course as preparation for their health service employment. It can be determined from Tables OC-6 through OC-16 that of the 22 possible choices as most valuable and second most valuable course as preparation for the various sections of NYSBODL and actual employment, Contact Lenses I was selected five times, Contact Lenses II and Ophthalmic Dispensing I were selected four times each and Ophthalmic Dispensing II was selected three times. Of the 22 possible choices as least valuable and second least valuable course as preparation for the same areas, Contact Lenses II and Ophthalmic Materials I were selected five times each and Ophthalmic Materials II was selected four times.

Table OC-17 lists the course grades, of graduates of the Ophthalmic Dispensing department, for selected Career Learning courses. It can be seen that the mean grade varies from 2.842 (Contact Lenses I) to 3.842 (Ophthalmic Materials I) a difference that is statistically significant to a level of .0001. The mean grade for English Composition, 2.615, is unusually low, based on the mean grades for English Composition of other departments in the division.

Graduates' perception of the course component that was the best preparation for each section of NYSBODL is shown in Table OC-18. It

can be seen that graduates of the Ophthalmic Dispensing department perceive Lectures to be the best preparation for the Theoretical Optics section, Ophthalmic Dispensing section, and Ophthalmic Optics section. They perceive Lectures and Reading Material to be equally good preparation for the Anatomy/Physiology section and Contact Lenses Oral Procedures section; Laboratories to be the best preparation for the Ophthalmic Materials section, Practical Dispensing section, Contact Lenses Fitting section, and Contact Lenses Practical section; Discussion to be the best preparation for the Contact Lenses Written section.

Tables OC-19 and OC-20 present the Ophthalmic Dispensing department graduates' perception of their Career Learning instructors and teaching strategies as preparation for the various sections of NYSBODL. It can be seen in Table OC-19 that the majority of graduates perceived their instructors to be Very Good or Excellent as help in preparing for all sections of the examination. Instructors' help was rated highest for the Ophthalmic Dispensing and Ophthalmic Materials sections; lowest for the Anatomy/Physiology and Contact Lenses Written section where 36.8% and 22.2% of the graduates, respectively, rated instructors' help as Poor. Table OC-20 indicates graduates' perceptions of teaching strategy most helpful as preparation for the various sections of NYSBODL. It is shown that graduates perceive Subject Matter Stressed to be most helpful for all sections except Ophthalmic Dispensing and Ophthalmic Materials for which graduates perceive Teachers' Comments and Method of Presentation, respectively, to be most helpful.

Tables OC-21 and OC-22 provide Ophthalmic Dispensing department graduates' perception of their N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum as preparation for NYSBODL and for each section of NYSBODL. It can be seen in Table OC-21 that 47.6% of graduates perceive their training at N.Y.C.C.C. to be Very Good or Excellent preparation for NYSBODL and only 4.8% perceive their training to be poor preparation for the examination. Table OC-22 provides an analysis by section and shows a rather wide variation in perception of N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum as preparation for NYSBODL. Eighty to ninety percent of the graduates perceive their curriculum to be Excellent or Good as preparation for the Ophthalmic Dispensing section, Ophthalmic Materials section, and Practical Dispensing section. Less than 40% of graduates perceive their training to be Excellent or Good preparation for the Contact Lenses Written section, Contact Lenses Oral section, and Contact Lenses Fitting section. Twenty percent or greater perceive their N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum to be Poor or Very Poor for the Anatomy/Physiology section, Contact Lenses Written section, Contact Lenses Fitting section, and Contact Lenses Practical section. Referring back to Table OC-21, however, more than 85% of graduates perceive their N.Y.C.C.C. training to be Good, Very Good, or Excellent, on an overall basis.

To determine whether one or more course grades were predictive of success on the various sections of NYSBODL, correlations between graduates' scores on each section of NYSBODL and their course grades were computed. The following subjects, listed in order of decreasing significance,

correlated at a significant level ($P > .01$) with the NYSBODL sections indicated:

Contact Lenses I - Contact Lenses, Written

Physics I - Ocular Anatomy

Ophthalmic Materials I - Mathematics

Principles of Chemistry and Biology - Contact Lenses, Practical

Principles of Optics I - Contact Lenses, Fitting

Principles of Optics I - Ophthalmic Dispensing

Principles of Optics II - Physics.

A high grade in the above listed subjects was predictive of a high grade in the NYSBODL section indicated, for Ophthalmic Dispensing graduates.

Several high negative correlations were also found. Graduates' grades in Special Visual Aids were found to have an inverse relationship with all sections of NYSBODL except Theoretical Optics. This would indicate that a high grade in Special Visual Aids was predictive of a low grade in all sections of NYSBODL except Theoretical Optics. Additional non-significant, but negative, correlations were also found.

Because of the relative low significance of the positive correlations, the fact that except for Contact Lenses I courses do not correlate at all with their respective NYSBODL sections, and the completely unacceptable negative correlations, it is suggested that a thorough review of the methods of evaluation, used by the faculty of the department, be

instigated. Evaluation of students' subject knowledge and ability should be highly predictive of their success on the NYSBODL examination.

Table OC-1

Graduates' scores on each section of N.Y.S.
Board for Ophthalmic Dispensary Licensure Examination

180

Section	41-50	51-60	61-70	71-80	81-90	91-100	Total
Physics	1	0	0	2	3	1	7
Math	0	0	1	1	1	3	6
Ophthalmic Materials	0	0	1	4	5	1	11
Ophthalmic Optics	0	0	1	3	6	0	10
Ophthalmic Dispensing	0	1	0	6	5	0	12
Contact Lenses, Fitting	1	1	2	2	3	2	11
Contact Lenses, Practical	0	0	0	1	11	1	13
Theoretical Optics	0	0	0	1	4	0	5
Ocular Anatomy	0	0	0	4	1	0	5
Contact Lenses, Written	0	0	0	2	2	0	4
Contact Lenses, Oral Procedures	0	0	0	1	2	1	4

Selected statistics describing sections of N.Y.S.
Board for Ophthalmic Dispensary Licensure Examination

Section	Mean	Standard Deviation	Low Score	High Score	Median Score
Physics	76.857	17.004	40	90	82.00
Math	84.667	10.577	68	95	87.00
Ophthalmic Materials	82.500	7.379	68	95	82.50
Ophthalmic Optics	78.250	10.244	51	89	80.00
Ophthalmic Dispensing	79.750	8.069	60	90	79.75
Contact Lenses, Fitting	75.909	15.488	44	96	77.75
Contact Lenses, Practical	85.231	4.304	78	93	84.25
Theoretical Optics	82.400	2.966	78	86	82.25
Ocular Anatomy	79.000	3.082	75	83	79.25
Contact Lenses, Written	78.000	4.546	72	82	79.00
Contact Lenses, Oral Procedures	84.250	6.131	78	92	83.50

Table OC-3

Number of attempts necessary
for graduates to pass N.Y.S
Board for Ophthalmic Dispensary
Licensure Examination

Graduates	1	2	3	4	5	More than 5	Did not pass	Total
Number	12	2	3	0	0	1	2	20
Percent	60.0	10.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	10.0	100.0

Table OC-4

N.Y.S. Board for Ophthalmic Dispensary
Licensure Examination year, by attempt

Year	1st attempt	2nd attempt	Total
1969	2	0	2
1970	2	0	2
1971	6	0	6
1972	6	0	6
1973	4	1	5
1974	1	1	2

Table OC-5

Graduates' attempt at American Board of
Opticianary Certification Examination

Graduates	Yes	No
Number	7	14
Percent	33.3	66.7

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for the Theoretical Optics section of N.Y.S. Board for Ophthalmic Dispensary Licensure Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Ophthalmic materials I	Number	7	7	2	0	3	7
	%	36.8	36.8	10.5	0.0	15.8	
Ophthalmic materials II	Number	8	6	2	0	3	5
	%	42.1	31.6	10.5	0.0	15.8	
Anatomy and Physiology of Eye	Number	5	7	3	2	3	10
	%	26.3	36.8	10.5	10.5	15.8	
Principles of Optics I	Number	12	6	1	0	0	1
	%	63.2	31.6	5.3	0.0	0.0	
Ophthalmic materials III	Number	6	8	2	0	3	8
	%	31.6	42.1	10.5	0.0	15.8	
Ophthalmic Dispensing I	Number	6	7	2	1	1	4
	%	35.3	41.2	11.8	5.9	5.9	
Principles of Optics II	Number	11	6	1	0	0	2
	%	61.1	33.3	5.6	0.0	0.0	
Contact Lenses I	Number	3	7	5	0	2	9
	%	17.6	41.2	29.4	0.0	11.8	
Ophthalmic Dispensing II	Number	8	4	3	0	2	3
	%	47.1	23.5	17.6	0.0	11.8	
Special Visual Aids	Number	7	5	3	1	2	6
	%	38.9	27.8	16.7	5.6	11.1	
Contact Lenses II	Number	3	6	6	0	2	11
	%	17.6	35.3	35.3	0.0	11.8	

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses
as preparation for the Anatomy/Physiology section of N.Y.S.
Board for Ophthalmic Dispensary Licensure Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Ophthalmic materials I	Number	1	6	4	1	6	6
	%	5.6	33.3	22.2	5.6	33.3	
Ophthalmic materials II	Number	1	6	4	1	6	7
	%	5.6	33.3	22.2	5.6	33.3	
Anatomy and Physiology of Eye	Number	9	4	2	2	1	1
	%	50.0	22.2	11.1	11.1	5.6	
Principles of Optics I	Number	3	9	1	1	4	5
	%	16.7	50.0	5.6	5.6	22.2	
Ophthalmic materials III	Number	1	7	4	1	5	11
	%	5.6	38.9	22.2	5.6	27.8	
Ophthalmic Dispensing I	Number	3	6	2	1	6	10
	%	16.7	33.3	11.1	5.6	33.3	
Principles of Optics II	Number	4	8	1	1	4	4
	%	22.2	44.4	5.6	5.6	22.2	
Contact Lenses I	Number	6	8	1	0	2	2
	%	35.3	47.1	5.9	0.0	11.8	
Ophthalmic Dispensing II	Number	4	6	2	1	5	9
	%	22.2	33.3	11.1	5.6	27.8	
Special Visual Aids	Number	3	8	1	1	4	8
	%	17.6	47.1	5.9	5.9	23.5	
Contact Lenses II	Number	5	7	1	1	2	3
	%	31.3	43.8	6.3	6.3	12.5	

Table OC-8

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for the Ophthalmic Dispensing section of N.Y.S. Board for Ophthalmic Dispensary Licensure Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Ophthalmic materials I	Number	7	10	1	0	0	5
	%	38.9	55.6	5.6	0.0	0.0	
Ophthalmic materials II	Number	8	9	1	0	0	4
	%	44.4	50.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	
Anatomy and Physiology of Eye	Number	4	6	2	1	4	7
	%	23.5	35.3	11.8	5.9	23.5	
Principles of Optics I	Number	5	7	1	1	2	8
	%	31.3	43.8	6.3	6.3	12.5	
Ophthalmic materials III	Number	8	9	1	0	0	3
	%	44.4	50.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	
Ophthalmic Dispensing I	Number	15	3	0	0	0	1
	%	83.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Principles of Optics II	Number	6	7	1	1	2	6
	%	35.3	41.2	5.9	5.9	11.8	
Contact Lenses I	Number	2	7	4	0	3	10
	%	12.5	43.8	25.0	0.0	18.8	
Ophthalmic Dispensing II	Number	13	4	0	0	0	2
	%	76.5	23.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Special Visual Aids	Number	4	8	0	1	4	9
	%	23.5	47.1	0.0	5.9	23.5	
Contact Lenses II	Number	2	7	3	0	4	11
	%	12.5	43.8	18.8	0.0	25.0	

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses
as preparation for the Ophthalmic Materials section of
N.Y.S. Board for Ophthalmic Dispensary Licensure Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Ophthalmic materials I	Number	15	3	0	0	0	1
	%	83.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Ophthalmic materials II	Number	15	3	0	0	0	2
	%	83.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Anatomy and Physiology of Eye	Number	1	6	3	3	4	11
	%	5.9	35.3	17.6	17.6	23.5	
Principles of Optics I	Number	5	7	3	1	2	6
	%	27.8	38.9	16.7	5.6	11.1	
Ophthalmic materials III	Number	13	4	0	0	1	3
	%	72.2	22.2	0.0	0.0	5.6	
Ophthalmic Dispensing I	Number	7	11	0	0	0	4
	%	38.9	61.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Principles of Optics II	Number	5	6	3	1	2	7
	%	29.4	35.3	17.6	5.9	11.8	
Contact Lenses I	Number	2	6	4	1	3	8
	%	12.5	37.5	25.0	6.3	18.8	
Ophthalmic Dispensing II	Number	7	10	1	0	0	5
	%	38.9	55.6	5.6	0.0	0.0	
Special Visual Aids	Number	3	7	2	1	4	9
	%	17.6	41.2	11.8	5.9	23.5	
Contact Lenses II	Number	2	6	4	0	4	10
	%	12.5	37.5	25.0	0.0	25.0	

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for the Ophthalmic Optics section of N.Y.S. Board for Ophthalmic Dispensary Licensure Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Ophthalmic materials I	Number	6	4	4	0	2	5
	%	37.5	25.0	25.0	0.0	12.5	
Ophthalmic materials II	Number	5	5	4	0	2	6
	%	31.3	31.3	25.0	0.0	12.5	
Anatomy and Physiology of Eye	Number	5	6	1	3	3	8
	%	27.8	33.3	5.6	16.7	16.7	
Principles of Optics I	Number	10	4	0	1	2	3
	%	58.8	23.5	0.0	5.9	11.8	
Ophthalmic materials III	Number	5	5	4	0	2	7
	%	31.3	31.3	25.0	0.0	12.5	
Ophthalmic Dispensing I	Number	8	5	2	0	1	2
	%	50.0	31.3	12.5	0.0	6.3	
Principles of Optics II	Number	9	6	0	1	1	1
	%	52.5	35.3	0.0	5.9	5.9	
Contact Lenses I	Number	4	5	3	1	3	9
	%	25.0	31.3	18.8	6.3	18.8	
Ophthalmic Dispensing II	Number	7	7	1	0	2	4
	%	41.2	41.2	5.9	0.0	11.8	
Special Visual Aids	Number	4	4	4	0	4	10
	%	25.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	
Contact Lenses II	Number	4	3	3	1	4	11
	%	26.7	20.0	20.0	6.7	26.7	

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for the Practical Dispensing section of N.Y.S. Board for Ophthalmic Dispensary Licensure Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Ophthalmic materials I	Number	10	6	2	0	0	3
	%	55.6	33.3	11.1	0.0	0.0	
Ophthalmic materials II	Number	10	6	2	0	0	4
	%	55.6	33.3	11.1	0.0	0.0	
Anatomy and Physiology of Eye	Number	5	4	2	2	4	10
	%	29.4	23.5	11.8	11.8	23.5	
Principles of Optics I	Number	7	3	2	2	3	8
	%	41.2	17.6	11.8	11.8	17.6	
Ophthalmic materials III	Number	10	6	2	0	0	5
	%	55.6	33.3	11.1	0.0	0.0	
Ophthalmic Dispensing I	Number	15	3	0	0	0	1
	%	83.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Principles of Optics II	Number	8	4	1	1	3	6
	%	47.1	23.5	5.9	5.9	17.6	
Contact Lenses I	Number	3	6	3	1	3	9
	%	18.8	37.5	18.8	6.3	18.8	
Ophthalmic Dispensing II	Number	13	4	1	0	0	2
	%	72.2	22.2	5.6	0.0	0.0	
Special Visual Aids	Number	5	5	3	0	3	7
	%	31.3	31.3	18.8	0.0	18.8	
Contact Lenses II	Number	2	6	3	0	4	11
	%	13.3	40.0	20.0	0.0	26.7	

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for the Contact Lenses Written section of N.Y.S. Board for Ophthalmic Dispensary Licensure Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Ophthalmic materials I	Number	3	4	3	1	4	10
	%	20.0	26.7	20.0	6.7	26.7	
Ophthalmic materials II	Number	3	4	3	1	4	11
	%	20.0	26.7	20.0	6.7	26.7	
Anatomy and Physiology of Eye	Number	7	4	1	3	0	4
	%	46.7	26.7	6.7	20.0	0.0	
Principles of Optics I	Number	5	7	2	0	2	5
	%	31.3	43.8	12.5	0.0	12.5	
Ophthalmic materials III	Number	3	6	2	1	3	7
	%	20.0	40.0	13.3	6.7	20.0	
Ophthalmic Dispensing I	Number	4	5	2	1	3	6
	%	26.7	33.3	13.3	6.7	20.0	
Principles of Optics II	Number	6	7	2	0	1	3
	%	37.5	43.8	12.5	0.0	6.3	
Contact Lenses I	Number	12	4	0	0	1	1
	%	70.6	23.5	0.0	0.0	5.9	
Ophthalmic Dispensing II	Number	4	5	2	1	4	9
	%	25.0	31.3	12.5	6.3	25.0	
Special Visual Aids	Number	5	3	2	1	4	8
	%	33.3	20.0	13.3	6.7	26.7	
Contact Lenses II	Number	10	4	0	0	2	2
	%	62.5	25.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for the Contact Lenses Oral Procedures section of N.Y.S. Board for Ophthalmic Dispensary Licensure Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Ophthalmic materials I	Number	1	5	2	0	5	11
	%	7.7	38.5	15.4	0.0	38.5	
Ophthalmic materials II	Number	1	5	2	0	5	10
	%	7.7	38.5	15.4	0.0	38.5	
Anatomy and Physiology of Eye	Number	5	5	0	2	2	3
	%	35.7	35.7	0.0	14.3	14.3	
Principles of Optics I	Number	3	6	1	1	3	4
	%	21.4	42.9	7.1	7.1	21.4	
Ophthalmic materials III	Number	2	5	1	0	6	9
	%	14.3	35.7	7.1	0.0	42.9	
Ophthalmic Dispensing I	Number	2	5	1	0	5	7
	%	15.4	38.4	7.7	0.0	38.5	
Principles of Optics II	Number	3	6	1	1	3	5
	%	21.4	42.9	7.1	7.1	21.4	
Contact Lenses I	Number	8	5	0	0	2	2
	%	53.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	13.3	
Ophthalmic Dispensing II	Number	2	4	2	0	5	8
	%	15.4	30.8	15.4	0.0	38.5	
Special Visual Aids	Number	3	4	1	0	5	6
	%	23.1	30.8	7.7	0.0	38.5	
Contact Lenses II	Number	9	4	0	0	1	1
	%	64.3	28.6	0.0	0.0	7.1	

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for the Contact Lenses Fitting section of N.Y.S. Board for Ophthalmic Dispensary Licensure Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Ophthalmic materials I	Number	2	3	1	1	6	11
	%	15.4	23.1	7.7	7.7	46.2	
Ophthalmic materials II	Number	2	4	1	1	5	10
	%	15.4	30.8	7.7	7.7	38.5	
Anatomy and Physiology of Eye	Number	8	1	0	2	3	3
	%	57.1	7.1	0.0	14.3	21.4	
Principles of Optics I	Number	3	5	0	1	4	5
	%	23.1	36.5	0.0	7.7	30.8	
Ophthalmic materials III	Number	2	4	1	1	5	9
	%	15.4	30.8	7.7	7.7	38.5	
Ophthalmic Dispensing I	Number	3	3	1	1	5	8
	%	23.1	23.1	7.7	7.7	38.5	
Principles of Optics II	Number	5	5	0	0	4	4
	%	35.7	35.7	0.0	0.0	28.6	
Contact Lenses I	Number	10	3	0	0	1	2
	%	71.4	21.4	0.0	0.0	7.1	
Ophthalmic Dispensing II	Number	5	2	1	1	5	6
	%	35.7	14.3	7.1	7.1	35.7	
Special Visual Aids	Number	4	2	1	1	6	7
	%	28.6	14.3	7.1	7.1	42.9	
Contact Lenses II	Number	11	2	0	0	1	1
	%	78.6	14.3	0.0	0.0	7.1	

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses
as preparation for the Contact Lenses Practical section
of N.Y.S. Board for Ophthalmic Dispensary Licensure Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Ophthalmic materials I	Number	1	4	2	2	4	10
	%	7.7	30.8	15.4	15.4	30.8	
Ophthalmic materials II	Number	1	4	2	2	4	11
	%	7.7	30.8	15.4	15.4	30.8	
Anatomy and Physiology of Eye	Number	8	1	0	3	3	3
	%	53.3	6.7	0.0	20.0	20.0	
Principles of Optics I	Number	4	4	1	2	3	5
	%	28.6	28.6	7.1	14.3	21.4	
Ophthalmic materials III	Number	2	4	2	2	5	9
	%	13.3	26.7	13.3	13.3	33.3	
Ophthalmic Dispensing I	Number	4	2	2	2	3	6
	%	30.8	15.4	15.4	15.4	23.1	
Principles of Optics II	Number	4	6	1	1	4	4
	%	25.0	37.5	6.3	6.3	25.0	
Contact Lenses I	Number	11	3	1	0	0	1
	%	73.3	20.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	
Ophthalmic Dispensing II	Number	4	3	2	2	4	7
	%	26.7	20.0	13.3	13.3	26.7	
Special Visual Aids	Number	4	3	2	1	5	8
	%	26.7	20.0	13.3	6.7	33.3	
Contact Lenses II	Number	11	2	1	0	1	2
	%	73.3	13.3	6.7	0.0	6.7	

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for actual employment conditions

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Ophthalmic materials I	Number	8	12	0	0	0	5
	%	40.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Ophthalmic materials II	Number	9	11	0	0	0	4
	%	45.0	55.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Anatomy and Physiology of Eye	Number	6	8	2	3	1	10
	%	30.0	40.0	10.0	15.0	5.0	
Principles of Optics I	Number	5	13	0	1	1	6
	%	15.0	65.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	
Ophthalmic materials III	Number	10	10	0	0	0	3
	%	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Ophthalmic Dispensing I	Number	13	7	0	0	0	2
	%	65.0	35.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Principles of Optics II	Number	6	11	1	1	1	7
	%	30.0	55.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	
Contact Lenses I	Number	7	9	0	3	1	8
	%	35.0	45.0	0.0	15.0	5.0	
Ophthalmic Dispensing II	Number	15	5	0	0	0	1
	%	75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Special Visual Aids	Number	4	8	6	1	1	11
	%	20.0	40.0	30.0	5.0	5.0	
Contact Lenses II	Number	7	9	0	2	2	9
	%	35.0	45.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	

Graduates' grades for selected
Career Learning courses

Courses		A	B	C	D	Other	Mean Grade
							Standard Deviation
Ophthalmic materials I	Number	16	3	0	0	2	3.842
	%	76.2	14.3	0.0	0.0	9.5	0.375
Ophthalmic materials II	Number	15	3	0	1	2	3.684
	%	71.4	14.3	0.0	4.8	9.5	0.749
Ophthalmic materials III	Number	9	7	2	1	2	3.263
	%	42.9	33.3	9.5	4.8	9.5	0.872
Anatomy and Physiology of Eye	Number	9	7	2	1	2	3.263
	%	42.9	33.3	9.5	4.8	9.5	0.872
Principles of Optics I	Number	7	7	5	0	2	3.105
	%	33.3	33.3	23.8	0.0	9.5	0.809
Principles of Optics II	Number	6	7	5	1	2	2.947
	%	28.6	33.3	23.8	4.8	9.5	0.911
Ophthalmic Dispensing I	Number	11	7	1	0	2	3.526
	%	52.4	33.3	4.8	0.0	9.5	0.612
Ophthalmic Dispensing II	Number	9	8	2	0	2	3.368
	%	42.9	38.1	9.5	0.0	9.5	0.684
Contact Lenses I	Number	5	6	8	0	2	2.842
	%	23.8	28.6	38.1	0.0	9.5	0.834
Contact Lenses II	Number	5	9	2	0	5	3.188
	%	23.8	42.9	9.5	0.0	23.8	0.655
Special Visual Aids	Number	4	10	5	0	2	2.947
	%	19.0	47.6	23.8	0.0	9.5	0.705
English Composition	Number	1	6	6	0	8	2.615
	%	4.8	28.6	28.6	0.0	38.1	0.650

Graduates' perception of course component as best preparation for each section of N.Y.S. Board for Ophthalmic Dispensary Licensure Examination

		Labs	Reading Material	Written Assignments	Exams	Review Seminars	Lectures	Discussion
Theoretical Optics	Number	1	4	1	1	3	7	1
	%	5.6	22.2	5.6	5.6	16.7	38.9	5.6
Anatomy/Physiology	Number	0	6	1	1	4	6	0
	%	0.0	33.3	5.6	5.6	22.2	33.3	0.0
Ophthalmic Dispensing	Number	1	1	0	1	4	10	1
	%	5.6	5.6	0.0	5.6	22.2	55.6	5.6
Ophthalmic Materials	Number	8	0	0	1	4	4	1
	%	44.4	0.0	0.0	5.6	22.2	22.2	5.6
Ophthalmic Optics	Number	0	2	1	1	6	7	1
	%	0.0	11.1	5.6	5.6	33.3	38.9	5.6
Practical Dispensing	Number	13	0	0	0	2	3	0
	%	72.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	16.7	0.0
Contact Lens Written	Number	0	5	1	1	3	4	2
	%	0.0	31.3	6.3	6.3	18.8	25.0	12.5
Contact Lens Oral	Number	1	3	0	1	2	3	4
	%	7.1	21.4	0.0	7.1	14.3	21.4	28.6
Contact Lens Fitting	Number	8	2	0	0	2	2	1
	%	53.3	13.3	0.0	0.0	13.3	13.3	6.7
Contact Lens Practical	Number	11	2	0	0	2	1	1
	%	64.7	11.8	0.0	0.0	11.8	5.9	5.9

Graduates perception of Career Learning
instructors' help as preparation for each
section of N.Y.S. Board for Ophthalmic
Dispensary Licensure Examination

		Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Theoretical Optics	Number	11	4	3	1	0
	%	57.9	21.1	15.8	5.3	0.0
Anatomy/Physiology	Number	6	4	2	0	7
	%	31.6	21.1	10.5	0.0	36.8
Ophthalmic Dispensing	Number	11	7	1	0	0
	%	57.9	36.8	5.3	0.0	0.0
Ophthalmic Materials	Number	11	7	1	0	0
	%	57.9	36.8	5.3	0.0	0.0
Ophthalmic Optics	Number	8	5	4	0	1
	%	44.4	27.8	22.2	0.0	5.6
Practical Dispensing	Number	9	5	4	0	1
	%	47.4	26.3	21.1	0.0	5.3
Contact Lens Written	Number	5	6	2	1	4
	%	27.8	33.3	11.1	5.6	22.2
Contact Lens Oral	Number	5	4	3	3	1
	%	31.3	25.0	18.8	18.8	6.3
Contact Lens Fitting	Number	6	3	3	4	0
	%	37.5	18.8	18.8	25.0	0.0
Contact Lens Practical	Number	6	7	1	4	0
	%	33.3	38.9	5.6	22.2	0.0

Graduates' perception of teaching strategy
as best preparation for each section of N.Y.S.
Board for Ophthalmic Dispensary Licensure
Examination

		Subject matter stressed	Method of presentation of material	Response to questions	Teachers' comments	Individual assistance	Teaching aids
Theoretical Optics	Number	6	5	1	2	2	1
	%	35.3	29.4	5.9	11.8	11.8	5.9
Anatomy/ Physiology	Number	6	3	1	3	2	1
	%	37.5	18.8	6.3	18.8	12.5	6.3
Ophthalmic Dispensing	Number	4	4	2	6	0	1
	%	23.5	23.5	11.8	35.3	0.0	5.9
Ophthalmic Materials	Number	5	6	1	4	0	1
	%	29.4	35.3	5.9	23.5	0.0	5.9
Ophthalmic Optics	Number	4	2	2	3	3	2
	%	25.0	12.5	12.5	18.8	18.8	12.5
Practical Dispensing	Number	7	2	1	4	1	1
	%	43.8	12.5	6.3	25.0	6.3	6.3
Contact Lens Written	Number	5	5	1	1	1	1
	%	35.7	35.7	7.1	7.1	7.1	7.1
Contact Lens Oral	Number	4	2	1	3	2	1
	%	30.8	15.4	7.7	23.1	15.4	7.7
Contact Lens Fitting	Number	5	1	2	2	1	1
	%	38.5	7.7	15.4	15.4	7.7	7.7
Contact Lens Practical	Number	5	2	1	3	2	2
	%	33.3	13.3	6.7	20.0	13.3	13.3

Table OC-21

Graduates' perception of their N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum as preparation for N.Y.S. Board for Ophthalmic Dispensary Licensure Examination

Graduates	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Number	5	5	8	1	1
Percent	23.8	23.8	38.1	4.8	4.8

Graduates' perception of N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum
as preparation for each section of N.Y.S. Board
of Ophthalmic Dispensary Licensure Examination

		Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very Poor
Theoretical Optics	Number	4	11	4	1	0
	%	20.0	55.0	20.0	5.0	0.0
Anatomy/ Physiology	Number	4	7	3	3	3
	%	20.0	35.0	15.0	15.0	15.0
Ophthalmic Dispensing	Number	11	5	4	0	0
	%	55.0	25.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
Ophthalmic Materials	Number	11	7	2	0	0
	%	55.0	35.0	10.0	0.0	0.0
Ophthalmic Optics	Number	4	10	3	2	1
	%	20.0	50.0	15.0	10.0	5.0
Practical Dispensing	Number	10	6	1	2	1
	%	50.0	30.0	5.0	10.0	5.0
Contact Lens Written	Number	2	5	8	3	2
	%	10.0	25.0	40.0	15.0	10.0
Contact Lens Oral	Number	3	3	10	1	1
	%	16.7	16.7	55.6	5.6	5.6
Contact Lens Fitting	Number	2	5	5	5	1
	%	11.1	27.8	27.8	27.8	5.6
Contact Lens Practical	Number	4	6	6	2	2
	%	20.0	30.0	30.0	10.0	10.0

Radiologic Technology Licensure Section

To determine the success of graduates of the Radiologic Technology department of New York City Community College (N.Y.C.C.C.) on the New York State Licensing Examination (NYSL), and the graduates' perception of their N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum as preparation for the NYSL examination, this section of the division evaluation was prepared. Nine graduates of Radiologic Technology responded to the questionnaire mailed to all graduates; all nine respondents indicated they attempted the NYSL examination. The data herein is representative of the nine respondents, but caution should be exercised in generalizing conclusion based on data from this relatively small sample to the entire population of graduates.

Table RC-1 provides data describing scores obtained by responding graduates of Radiologic Technology department of N.Y.C.C.C. on the NYSL examination. Selected statistics describing the scores are also presented in Table RC-1. It can be seen that six graduates (66.7%) scored 70 or over on the examination. The highest score was 91; the lowest score was 52. Additional information provided by the respondents indicates that eight graduates (88.9%) made one attempt at the examination; one graduate (11.1%) made two attempts. Only one graduate provided information about the year of NYSL examination attempt: 1971. Eight respondents (88.9%) stated they also attempted the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists examination.

Tables RC-2 through RC-9 contain Radiologic Technology graduates' perception of the value of specific courses, in their curriculum at N.Y.C.C.C., as preparation for each section of the NYSL examination. Each table provides the number and percentage of responding graduates selecting each perceived value listing, as well as a rating of each course relative to the other listed courses. Because of the small number of respondents, and therefore the identity of value means, more than one course may occupy each rating position. It can be seen in Table RC-2 that Radiologic Technology graduates' perception of the most valuable course as preparation for the Radiographic Techniques section of NYSL examination was Radiologic Technique Lab II and

Clinical Practice II. Graduates' perception of the least valuable course as preparation for the same section was Dental Radiography. Graduates' perception of the most valuable course and least valuable course as preparation for the Standard Positioning section are shown in Table RC-3. They are Positioning II and Radiation Therapy, respectively.

Table RC-4 presents Radiologic Technology graduates' perception of the most valuable courses as preparation for the Anatomy and Physiology section. The courses selected are Positioning II and Positioning III. The least valuable courses for the same section are perceived to be X-Ray Physics and Radiation Therapy. Table RC-5 shows the graduates perceived X-Ray Physics to be the most valuable course as preparation for the X-Ray Physics section and Dental Radiography to be the least valuable course as preparation for the same section. Graduates' perception of the most valuable course and least valuable course as preparation for the Radiation Therapy section is shown in Table RC-6 to be X-Ray Physics and Dental Radiography, respectively.

Table RC-7 indicates graduates of the Radiologic Technology department perceived Special Procedures to be the most valuable course as preparation for the Special Procedures section and Radiation Therapy to be the least valuable course as preparation for the same section. The course graduates perceived to be the most valuable as preparation for the General Physics section is shown in Table RC-8 to be X-Ray

Physics. The course perceived to be least valuable as preparation for the same section is Dental Radiography. It can be seen from Table RC-9 that graduates perceived their Radiation Therapy course to be the best preparation for the Therapy section and Dental Radiography to be least valuable as preparation for the same section.

Table RC-10 extends the same course by course ratings to Radiologic Technology graduates' perception of value as preparation for actual employment conditions. It can be seen in Table RC-10 that graduates perceived Positioning III to be the most valuable course as preparation for their actual health service employment and Radiation Therapy to be the least valuable course as preparation for employment. It can be determined from Tables RC-2 through RC-10 that of a possible nine selection positions, X-Ray Physics was selected as most valuable course three times and least valuable course one time. Radiation Therapy was selected as least valuable course four times and most valuable course one time. Dental Radiography was selected as least valuable course five times.

Table RC-11 provides course grades of graduates of the Radiologic Technology department for selected Career Learning courses. It can be seen that the mean grade varies from a low of 1.875 (X-Ray Physics) to a high of 3.625 (Clinical Practice II). This difference is statistically significant to a level of 0.01. There is undoubtedly a relationship between the relatively low mean grade for Radiation

Therapy and its choice as least valuable course by a large percentage of graduates. Dental Radiography, the course perceived least valuable by a majority of graduates is not listed because no grades were reported for this course for responding graduates.

Graduates' perception of the course component that was perceived best preparation for each section of NYSL examination is provided in Table RC-12. It can be seen that Laboratories are perceived by Radiologic Technology graduates to be the best preparation for the Radiographic Technique section and Standard Positioning section. Reading Material is perceived to be the best preparation for the Radiation Therapy section, Special Procedures section, and General Physics section. No component is clearly selected as best preparation for the Anatomy/Physiology section, X-Ray Physics section, or Therapy section.

Tables RC-13 and RC-14 present Radiologic Technology department graduates' perception of their Career Learning instructors and teaching strategies as preparation for the various sections of NYSL examination. It can be determined from Table RC-13 that the majority of graduates perceived their instructors to be Excellent as help in preparing for the Anatomy/Physiology section, Very Good or Excellent as help in preparing for the Radiographic Techniques section and Standard Positioning section, and Good, Very Good, or Excellent as

help in preparing for the X-Ray Physics section, Radiation Therapy section, and Special Procedures section. The majority of graduates perceived their instructors to be Good, or Very Good as help in preparing for the General Physics section and Therapy section. Their instructors were perceived as least helpful as preparation for the Special Procedures section and General Physics section where 44.4% of graduates perceived their instructors' help as Fair or Poor.

Table RC-14 shows graduates' perceptions of teaching strategies most helpful as preparation for NYSL examination. It can be seen in this table that Subject Matter Stressed was perceived to be the most help as preparation for the Radiographic Techniques section, Standard Positioning section, and X-Ray Physics section. Method of Presentation of Material was perceived to be the most help as preparation for the Anatomy/Physiology section and General Physics section. Teachers' Comments was perceived to be the most help as preparation for the Radiation Therapy section and, with Method of Presentation of Material, the Therapy section.

Tables RC-15 and RC-16 provide Radiologic Technology graduates' perceptions of their N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum as preparation for NYSL examination, and for each section of the examination. It can be seen in Table RC-15 that 88.9% of the respondents perceive their overall training at N.Y.C.C.C. to be Good, Very Good, or Excellent. None of the respondents perceive their training to be Poor. When analyzed

by NYSL section, as shown in Table RC-16, it is evident that 44% of responding graduates perceived their training at N.Y.C.C.C. to be poor or very poor for the Therapy section and Special Procedures section, and 22% perceived their training to be poor or very poor for the General Physics section and Radiation Therapy section. A majority of respondents, however, perceived their training at N.Y.C.C.C. to be Excellent, Good, or Adequate for all sections of the NYSL examination.

To determine whether one or more course grades were predictive of success on the NYSL examination, correlations between graduates' scores on the NYSL and their course grades were computed. The following subjects, listed in decreasing order of significance, correlated at a significant level ($P > .025$) with the NYSL examination:

Radiographic Technique I

Clinical Practice III

Radiographic Technique II

Positioning I.

A high grade in the above four subjects was predictive of success in the NYSL examination for the nine responding graduates of the Radiologic Technology department. It is suggested that a larger sample of Radiologic Technology graduates be examined before any firm conclusions be drawn from these results.

Table RC-1

Graduates' scores on the New York
State Licensing Examination

Graduates	50-59	60-69	70-79	80-89	90-99
Number	1	1	2	3	1
Percent	12.5	12.5	25.0	37.5	12.5

Mean Score 75.875

Low Score 52

High Score 91

Median Score 79.50

Graduates' perception of the value of
specific courses as preparation for the
Radiographic Techniques section of N.Y.S.
Licensing Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Radiologic Technic I	Number	3	5	0	0	0	5
	%	37.5	62.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Radiologic Technic Lab I	Number	5	4	0	0	0	3
	%	55.6	44.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Positioning I	Number	3	5	1	0	0	7
	%	33.3	55.6	11.1	0.0	0.0	
Gross Anatomy I	Number	3	6	0	0	0	6
	%	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Radiologic Technic II	Number	5	4	0	0	0	3
	%	55.6	44.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Radiologic Technic Lab II	Number	6	3	0	0	0	1
	%	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Positioning II	Number	5	4	0	0	0	3
	%	55.6	44.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Clinical Practice I	Number	4	5	0	0	0	4
	%	44.4	55.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Gross Anatomy II	Number	5	4	0	0	0	3
	%	55.6	44.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Clinical Practice II	Number	6	3	0	0	0	1
	%	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Medical/Surgical Diseases	Number	5	4	0	0	0	3
	%	55.6	44.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Positioning III	Number	5	4	0	0	0	3
	%	55.6	44.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	

(Table RC-2 continued)

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Patient Care	Number	1	8	0	0	0	8
	%	11.1	88.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Radiologic Technic III	Number	4	4	1	0	0	6
	%	44.4	44.4	11.1	0.0	0.0	
Clinical Practice III	Number	5	3	0	0	0	2
	%	62.5	37.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	
X-Ray Physics	Number	2	6	1	0	0	8
	%	22.2	66.7	11.1	0.0	0.0	
Radiation Therapy	Number	1	6	1	1	0	10
	%	11.1	66.7	11.1	11.1	0.0	
Dental Radiography	Number	1	5	2	0	1	11
	%	11.1	55.6	22.2	0.0	11.1	
Special Procedures	Number	1	6	2	0	0	9
	%	11.1	66.7	22.2	0.0	0.0	
Clinical Practice IV	Number	5	4	0	0	0	3
	%	55.6	44.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Clinical Practice V	Number	5	4	0	0	0	3
	%	55.6	44.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	

Graduates' perception of the value of
specific courses as preparation for the
Standard Positioning section of N.Y.S.
Licensing Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Radiologic Technic I	Number	2	6	0	0	1	6
	%	22.2	66.7	0.0	0.0	11.1	
Radiologic Technic Lab I	Number	3	5	0	0	1	5
	%	33.3	55.6	0.0	0.0	11.1	
Positioning I	Number	6	3	0	0	0	2
	%	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Gross Anatomy I	Number	6	3	0	0	0	2
	%	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Radiologic Technic II	Number	2	6	0	0	1	6
	%	22.2	66.7	0.0	0.0	11.1	
Radiologic Technic Lab II	Number	3	5	0	0	1	5
	%	33.3	55.6	0.0	0.0	11.1	
Positioning II	Number	7	2	0	0	0	1
	%	77.8	22.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Clinical Practice I	Number	6	3	0	0	0	2
	%	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Gross Anatomy II	Number	6	3	0	0	0	2
	%	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Clinical Practice II	Number	6	3	0	0	0	2
	%	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Medical/Surgical Diseases	Number	3	4	1	0	1	6
	%	33.3	44.4	11.1	0.0	11.1	
Positioning III	Number	6	3	0	0	0	2
	%	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	

(Table RC-3 continued)

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Patient Care	Number	0	8	0	0	1	7
	%	0.0	88.9	0.0	0.0	11.1	
Radiologic Technic III	Number	4	4	0	0	1	4
	%	44.4	44.4	0.0	0.0	11.1	
Clinical Practice III	Number	6	3	0	0	0	2
	%	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	
X-Ray Physics	Number	1	5	2	0	1	8
	%	11.1	55.6	22.2	0.0	11.1	
Radiation Therapy	Number	2	3	2	1	1	9
	%	22.2	33.3	22.2	11.1	11.1	
Dental Radiography	Number	0	7	1	0	1	8
	%	0.0	77.8	11.1	0.0	11.1	
Special Procedures	Number	1	7	1	0	0	5
	%	11.1	77.8	11.1	0.0	0.0	
Clinical Practice IV	Number	6	3	0	0	0	2
	%	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Clinical Practice V	Number	6	3	0	0	0	2
	%	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for the Anatomy Physiology section of N.Y.S. Licensing Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Radiologic Technic I	Number	2	5	1	0	1	9
	%	22.2	55.6	11.1	0.0	11.1	
Radiologic Technic Lab I	Number	2	6	0	0	1	8
	%	22.2	66.7	0.0	0.0	11.1	
Positioning I	Number	5	4	0	0	0	3
	%	55.6	44.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Gross Anatomy I	Number	6	3	0	0	0	2
	%	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Radiologic Technic II	Number	2	5	1	0	1	9
	%	22.2	55.6	11.1	0.0	11.1	
Radiologic Technic Lab II	Number	3	5	0	0	1	7
	%	33.3	55.6	0.0	0.0	11.1	
Positioning II	Number	7	2	0	0	0	1
	%	77.8	22.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Clinical Practice I	Number	6	3	0	0	0	2
	%	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Gross Anatomy II	Number	5	4	0	0	0	3
	%	55.6	44.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Clinical Practice II	Number	6	3	0	0	0	2
	%	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Medical/Surgical Diseases	Number	4	5	0	0	0	4
	%	44.4	55.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Positioning III	Number	7	2	0	0	0	1
	%	77.8	22.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	

(Table RC-4 continued)

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Patient Care	Number	1	4	3	0	1	10
	%	11.1	44.4	33.3	0.0	11.1	
Radiologic Technic III	Number	5	3	0	0	1	5
	%	55.6	33.3	0.0	0.0	11.1	
Clinical Practice III	Number	5	3	0	0	1	5
	%	55.6	33.3	0.0	0.0	11.1	
X-Ray Physics	Number	1	3	4	0	1	11
	%	11.1	33.3	44.4	0.0	11.1	
Radiation Therapy	Number	1	3	4	0	1	11
	%	11.1	33.3	44.4	0.0	11.1	
Dental Radiography	Number	1	4	3	0	1	10
	%	11.1	44.3	33.3	0.0	11.1	
Special Procedures	Number	4	4	0	0	1	6
	%	44.4	44.4	0.0	0.0	11.1	
Clinical Practice IV	Number	6	3	0	0	0	2
	%	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Clinical Practice V	Number	6	3	0	0	0	2
	%	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	

Graduates' perception of the value of
specific courses as preparation for the
X-Ray Physics section of N.Y.S.
Licensing Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Radiologic Technic I	Number	4	4	1	0	0	2
	%	44.4	44.4	11.1	0.0	0.0	
Radiologic Technic Lab I	Number	3	4	1	0	0	3
	%	37.5	50.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	
Positioning I	Number	1	2	4	0	1	9
	%	12.5	25.0	50.0	0.0	12.5	
Gross Anatomy I	Number	1	3	3	0	1	8
	%	12.5	37.5	37.5	0.0	12.5	
Radiologic Technic II	Number	3	4	2	0	0	4
	%	33.3	44.4	22.2	0.0	0.0	
Radiologic Technic Lab II	Number	3	3	2	0	0	4
	%	37.5	37.5	25.0	0.0	0.0	
Positioning II	Number	1	3	3	0	1	8
	%	12.5	37.5	37.5	0.0	12.5	
Clinical Practice I	Number	2	3	2	0	1	6
	%	25.0	37.5	25.0	0.0	12.5	
Gross Anatomy II	Number	0	5	2	0	1	8
	%	0.0	62.5	25.0	0.0	12.5	
Clinical Practice II	Number	2	3	2	0	1	6
	%	25.0	37.5	25.0	0.0	12.5	
Medical/Surgical Diseases	Number	1	4	2	0	1	7
	%	12.5	50.0	25.0	0.0	12.5	
Positioning III	Number	2	2	3	0	1	7
	%	25.0	25.0	37.5	0.0	12.5	

(Table RC-5 continued)

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Patient Care	Number	0	4	3	0	1	9
	%	0.0	50.0	37.5	0.0	12.5	
Radiologic Technic III	Number	5	2	2	0	0	2
	%	55.6	22.2	22.2	0.0	0.0	
Clinical Practice III	Number	1	4	2	0	1	7
	%	12.5	50.0	25.0	0.0	12.5	
X-Ray Physics	Number	5	3	0	0	0	1
	%	62.5	37.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Radiation Therapy	Number	3	3	2	1	0	5
	%	33.3	33.3	22.2	11.1	0.0	
Dental Radiography	Number	0	2	4	1	1	10
	%	0.0	25.0	50.0	12.5	12.5	
Special Procedures	Number	1	4	2	0	1	7
	%	12.5	50.0	25.0	0.0	12.5	
Clinical Practice IV	Number	2	3	1	1	1	7
	%	25.0	37.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	
Clinical Practice V	Number	2	3	1	1	1	7
	%	25.0	37.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for the Radiation Therapy section of N.Y.S. Licensing Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Radiologic Technic I	Number	2	4	1	0	1	3
	%	25.0	50.0	12.5	0.0	12.5	
Radiologic Technic Lab I	Number	2	3	2	0	1	4
	%	25.0	37.5	25.0	0.0	12.5	
Positioning I	Number	3	2	2	0	1	3
	%	37.5	25.0	25.0	0.0	12.5	
Gross Anatomy I	Number	2	4	1	0	1	3
	%	25.0	50.0	12.5	0.0	12.5	
Radiologic Technic II	Number	2	4	2	0	1	4
	%	22.2	44.4	22.2	0.0	11.1	
Radiologic Technic Lab II	Number	0	3	3	0	1	6
	%	0.0	42.9	42.9	0.0	14.3	
Positioning II	Number	2	3	2	0	1	4
	%	25.0	37.5	25.0	0.0	12.5	
Clinical Practice I	Number	2	4	1	0	1	3
	%	25.0	50.0	12.5	0.0	12.5	
Gross Anatomy II	Number	2	4	1	0	1	3
	%	25.0	50.0	12.5	0.0	12.5	
Clinical Practice II	Number	2	4	1	0	1	3
	%	25.0	50.0	12.5	0.0	12.5	
Medical/Surgical Diseases	Number	1	4	2	0	1	5
	%	12.5	50.0	25.0	0.0	12.5	
Positioning III	Number	2	3	2	0	1	4
	%	25.0	37.5	25.0	0.0	12.5	

(continued next page)

(Table RC-6 continued)

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Patient Care	Number	2	3	2	0	1	4
	%	25.0	37.5	25.0	0.0	12.5	
Radiologic Technic III	Number	2	3	3	0	1	5
	%	22.2	33.3	33.3	0.0	11.1	
Clinical Practice III	Number	2	4	1	0	1	3
	%	25.0	50.0	12.5	0.0	12.5	
X-Ray Physics	Number	4	3	2	0	0	1
	%	44.4	33.3	22.2	0.0	0.0	
Radiation Therapy	Number	5	2	1	0	1	2
	%	55.6	22.2	11.1	0.0	11.1	
Dental Radiography	Number	0	2	4	1	1	7
	%	0.0	25.0	50.0	12.5	12.5	
Special Procedures	Number	0	5	2	0	1	6
	%	0.0	62.5	25.0	0.0	12.5	
Clinical Practice IV	Number	2	4	0	1	1	4
	%	25.0	50.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	
Clinical Practice V	Number	2	4	0	1	1	4
	%	25.0	50.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	

Graduates' perception of the value of
specific courses as preparation for the
Special Procedures section of N.Y.S.
Licensing Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Radiologic Technic I	Number	1	3	2	0	2	7
	%	12.5	37.5	25.0	0.0	25.0	
Radiologic Technic Lab I	Number	1	4	1	0	2	6
	%	12.5	50.0	12.5	0.0	25.0	
Positioning I	Number	3	4	0	0	1	3
	%	37.5	50.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	
Gross Anatomy I	Number	4	3	0	0	1	2
	%	50.0	37.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	
Radiologic Technic II	Number	1	5	0	0	2	5
	%	12.5	62.5	0.0	0.0	25.0	
Radiologic Technic Lab II	Number	1	5	0	0	2	5
	%	12.5	62.5	0.0	0.0	25.0	
Positioning II	Number	3	4	0	0	1	3
	%	37.5	50.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	
Clinical Practice I	Number	4	2	0	1	1	4
	%	50.0	25.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	
Gross Anatomy II	Number	4	3	0	0	1	2
	%	50.0	37.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	
Clinical Practice II	Number	4	3	0	0	1	2
	%	50.0	37.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	
Medical/Surgical Diseases	Number	4	2	1	0	1	3
	%	50.0	25.0	12.5	0.0	12.5	
Positioning III	Number	4	3	0	0	1	2
	%	50.0	37.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	

(Table RC-7 continued)

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Patient Care	Number	1	4	1	0	2	6
	%	12.5	50.0	12.5	0.0	25.0	
Radiologic Technic III	Number	2	3	1	0	2	5
	%	25.0	37.5	12.5	0.0	25.0	
Clinical Practice III	Number	4	3	1	0	1	2
	%	44.4	33.3	11.1	0.0	11.1	
X-Ray Physics	Number	1	4	1	0	2	6
	%	12.5	50.0	12.5	0.0	25.0	
Radiation Therapy	Number	0	2	3	0	3	9
	%	0.0	25.0	37.5	0.0	37.5	
Dental Radiography	Number	0	2	3	1	2	8
	%	0.0	25.0	37.5	12.5	25.0	
Special Procedures	Number	6	1	0	0	0	1
	%	85.7	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Clinical Practice IV	Number	4	3	0	0	1	2
	%	50.0	37.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	
Clinical Practice V	Number	4	3	0	0	1	2
	%	50.0	37.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	

Graduates' perception of the value of
specific courses as preparation for the
General Physics section of N.Y.S.
Licensing Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Radiologic Technic I	Number	3	4	2	0	0	2
	%	33.3	44.4	22.2	0.0	0.0	
Radiologic Technic Lab I	Number	2	4	2	0	1	4
	%	22.2	44.4	22.2	0.0	11.1	
Positioning I	Number	0	4	3	0	2	7
	%	0.0	44.4	33.3	0.0	22.2	
Gross Anatomy I	Number	0	3	4	0	2	8
	%	0.0	33.3	44.4	0.0	22.2	
Radiologic Technic II	Number	2	5	1	0	1	3
	%	22.2	55.6	11.1	0.0	11.1	
Radiologic Technic Lab II	Number	2	4	2	0	1	4
	%	22.2	44.4	22.2	0.0	11.1	
Positioning II	Number	0	3	4	0	2	8
	%	0.0	33.3	44.4	0.0	22.2	
Clinical Practice I	Number	1	3	3	0	2	6
	%	11.1	33.3	33.3	0.0	22.2	
Gross Anatomy II	Number	0	3	4	0	2	8
	%	0.0	33.3	44.4	0.0	22.2	
Clinical Practice II	Number	1	4	2	0	2	5
	%	11.1	44.4	22.2	0.0	22.2	
Medical/Surgical Diseases	Number	0	3	4	0	2	8
	%	0.0	33.3	44.4	0.0	22.2	
Positioning III	Number	0	2	5	0	2	9
	%	0.0	22.2	55.6	0.0	22.2	

(Table RC-8 continued)

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Patient Care	Number	0	3	4	0	2	8
	%	0.0	33.3	44.4	0.0	22.2	
Radiologic Technic III	Number	1	0	7	0	1	4
	%	11.1	0.0	77.8	0.0	11.1	
Clinical Practice III	Number	0	4	3	0	2	7
	%	0.0	44.4	33.3	0.0	22.2	
X-Ray Physics	Number	3	6	0	0	0	1
	%	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Radiation Therapy	Number	2	4	2	0	1	4
	%	22.2	44.4	22.2	0.0	11.1	
Dental Radiography	Number	0	1	5	1	2	10
	%	0.0	11.1	55.6	11.1	22.2	
Special Procedures	Number	0	3	4	0	2	8
	%	0.0	33.3	44.4	0.0	22.2	
Clinical Practice IV	Number	1	4	2	0	2	5
	%	11.1	44.4	22.2	0.0	22.2	
Clinical Practice V	Number	1	4	2	0	2	5
	%	11.1	44.4	22.2	0.0	22.2	

Graduates' perception of the value of specific courses as preparation for the Therapy section of N.Y.S. Licensing Examination

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Radiologic Technic I	Number	1	4	1	1	1	8
	%	12.5	50.0	12.5	12.5	12.5	
Radiologic Technic Lab I	Number	1	4	1	1	1	8
	%	12.5	50.0	12.5	12.5	12.5	
Positioning I	Number	2	2	2	1	1	8
	%	25.0	25.0	25.0	12.5	12.5	
Gross Anatomy I	Number	2	5	1	0	0	2
	%	25.0	62.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	
Radiologic Technic II	Number	1	4	1	1	1	8
	%	12.5	50.0	12.5	12.5	12.5	
Radiologic Technic Lab II	Number	1	4	1	1	1	8
	%	12.5	50.0	12.5	12.5	12.5	
Positioning II	Number	2	2	2	1	1	8
	%	25.0	25.0	25.0	12.5	12.5	
Clinical Practice I	Number	3	1	1	1	2	9
	%	37.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	25.0	
Gross Anatomy II	Number	2	5	1	0	0	2
	%	25.0	62.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	
Clinical Practice II	Number	3	2	1	0	2	7
	%	37.5	25.0	12.5	0.0	25.0	
Medical/Surgical Diseases	Number	2	5	1	0	0	2
	%	25.0	62.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	
Positioning III	Number	2	2	2	1	1	8
	%	25.0	25.0	25.0	12.5	12.5	

(Table RC-9 continued)

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Patient Care	Number	2	4	1	1	1	4
	%	22.2	44.4	11.1	11.1	11.1	
Radiologic Technic III	Number	2	2	2	1	1	8
	%	25.0	25.0	25.0	12.5	12.5	
Clinical Practice III	Number	3	2	1	1	1	6
	%	37.5	25.0	12.5	12.5	12.5	
X-Ray Physics	Number	3	3	1	0	1	3
	%	37.5	37.5	12.5	0.0	12.5	
Radiation Therapy	Number	4	3	0	0	1	1
	%	50.0	37.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	
Dental Radiography	Number	0	1	4	1	2	11
	%	0.0	12.5	50.0	12.5	25.0	
Special Procedures	Number	0	4	2	0	2	10
	%	0.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	
Clinical Practice IV	Number	3	2	1	1	1	5
	%	37.5	25.0	12.5	12.5	12.5	
Clinical Practice V	Number	3	3	0	1	1	4
	%	37.5	37.5	0.0	12.5	12.5	

Graduates' perception of the value of
specific courses as preparation for
actual employment conditions

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Radiologic Technic I	Number	1	6	1	0	0	9
	%	12.5	75.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	
Radiologic Technic Lab I	Number	1	6	1	0	0	9
	%	12.5	75.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	
Positioning I	Number	4	3	1	0	0	6
	%	50.0	37.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	
Gross Anatomy I	Number	5	3	0	0	0	3
	%	62.5	37.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Radiologic Technic II	Number	1	7	0	0	0	8
	%	12.5	87.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Radiologic Technic Lab II	Number	1	7	0	0	0	8
	%	12.5	87.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Positioning II	Number	6	3	0	0	0	2
	%	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Clinical Practice I	Number	6	3	0	0	0	2
	%	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Gross Anatomy II	Number	5	3	0	0	0	3
	%	62.5	37.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Clinical Practice II	Number	6	3	0	0	0	2
	%	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Medical/Surgical Diseases	Number	4	4	0	0	0	4
	%	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Positioning III	Number	6	2	0	0	0	1
	%	75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	255

(continued next page)

(Table RC-10 continued)

Courses		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply	Rating
Patient Care	Number	3	5	0	0	0	6
	%	37.5	62.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Radiologic Technic III	Number	2	6	0	0	0	7
	%	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Clinical Practice III	Number	4	5	0	0	0	5
	%	44.4	55.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	
X-Ray Physics	Number	6	2	0	0	0	10
	%	75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Radiation Therapy	Number	0	2	4	2	0	12
	%	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	
Dental Radiography	Number	0	3	3	2	0	11
	%	0.0	37.5	37.5	25.0	0.0	
Special Procedures	Number	0	7	0	0	0	9
	%	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Clinical Practice IV	Number	6	3	0	0	0	2
	%	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Clinical Practice V	Number	6	3	0	0	0	2
	%	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	

Graduates' grades for selected
Career Learning courses

Course		A	B	C	D	Other	Mean Grade Standard Deviation
Radiographic Technique I	Number	1	4	1	2	1	2.500
	%	11.1	44.4	11.1	22.2	11.1	1.069
Radiographic Technique Lab I	Number	0	3	0	0	6	3.000
	%	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.000
Positioning I	Number	2	4	2	0	1	3.000
	%	22.2	44.4	22.2	0.0	11.1	0.756
Gross Anatomy I	Number	1	1	5	1	1	2.250
	%	11.1	11.1	55.6	11.1	11.1	0.886
Radiologic Technique II	Number	0	7	1	0	1	2.875
	%	0.0	77.8	11.1	0.0	11.1	0.354
Positioning II	Number	4	1	3	0	1	3.125
	%	44.4	11.1	33.3	0.0	11.1	0.991
Gross Anatomy II	Number	3	2	2	1	1	2.875
	%	33.3	22.2	22.2	11.1	11.1	1.126
Clinical Practice II	Number	6	1	1	0	1	3.625
	%	66.7	11.1	11.1	0.0	11.1	0.744
Radiographic Technique III	Number	3	5	0	0	1	3.375
	%	33.3	55.6	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.518
Clinical Practices III	Number	1	4	1	0	3	3.000
	%	11.1	44.4	11.1	0.0	33.3	0.632
X-Ray Physics	Number	0	1	5	2	1	1.875
	%	0.0	11.1	55.6	22.1	11.1	0.641

(Table RC-11 continued)

Course		A	B	C	D	Other	Mean Grade
							Standard Deviation
Radiation Therapy	Number	0	3	3	2	1	2.125
	%	0.0	33.3	33.3	22.2	11.1	0.835
Clinical Practice IV	Number	1	0	1	0	7	3.500
	%	11.1	0.0	11.1	0.0	77.8	0.707
English Composition	Number	0	2	5	1	1	2.125
	%	0.0	22.2	55.6	11.1	11.1	0.641

Graduates' perception of course component
as best preparation for each section of
New York State Licensing Examination

Section		Labs	Material	Assignments	Exams	Seminars	Lectures	Discussion
Radiographic Techniques	Number	4	2	0	0	1	0	1
	%	50.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	12.5
Standard Positioning	Number	4	0	0	1	1	1	2
	%	44.4	0.0	0.0	11.1	11.1	11.1	22.2
Anatomy/ Physiology	Number	2	2	2	0	1	0	2
	%	22.2	22.2	22.2	0.0	11.1	0.0	22.2
X-Ray Physics	Number	1	2	1	1	1	1	2
	%	11.1	22.2	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1	22.2
Radiation Therapy	Number	0	3	2	0	0	2	1
	%	0.0	37.5	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	12.5
Special Procedures	Number	1	3	1	0	0	2	1
	%	12.5	37.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	25.0	12.5
General Physics	Number	1	3	1	1	0	2	0
	%	12.5	37.5	12.5	12.5	0.0	25.0	0.0
Therapy	Number	1	2	0	1	1	2	0
	%	14.3	28.6	0.0	14.3	14.3	28.6	0.0

Table RC-13

Graduates' perception of Career Learning instructors' help as preparation for each section of the New York State Licensing Examination

Section		Excellent	Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Radiographic Techniques	Number	1	5	3	0	0
	%	11.1	55.6	33.3	0.0	0.0
Standard Positioning	Number	4	1	4	0	0
	%	44.4	11.1	44.4	0.0	0.0
Anatomy/Physiology	Number	6	1	1	1	0
	%	66.7	11.1	11.1	11.1	0.0
X-Ray Physics	Number	3	1	3	1	1
	%	33.3	11.1	33.3	11.1	11.1
Radiation Therapy	Number	1	2	3	2	1
	%	11.1	22.2	33.3	22.2	11.1
Special Procedures	Number	1	1	3	2	2
	%	11.1	11.1	33.3	22.2	22.2
General Physics	Number	0	3	2	2	2
	%	0.0	33.3	22.2	22.2	22.2
Therapy	Number	0	2	5	2	0
	%	0.0	22.2	55.6	22.2	0.0

Table RC-14

Graduates' perception of teaching strategy
as best preparation for each section of New
York State Licensing Examination

Section		Subject matter stressed	Method of presentation of material	Response to questions	Teachers' comments	Individual assistance	Teaching aids
Radiographic Techniques	Number	5	1	1	1	0	0
	%	55.6	11.1	11.1	11.1	0.0	0.0
Standard Positioning	Number	4	1	0	0	2	2
	%	44.4	11.1	0.0	0.0	22.2	22.2
Anatomy/ Physiology	Number	3	4	1	1	0	0
	%	33.3	44.4	11.1	11.1	0.0	0.0
X-Ray Physics	Number	4	1	0	2	1	0
	%	50.0	12.5	0.0	25.0	12.5	0.0
Radiation Therapy	Number	1	2	2	3	0	0
	%	12.5	25.0	25.0	37.5	0.0	0.0
Special Procedures	Number	2	2	2	1	1	0
	%	25.5	25.5	25.5	12.5	12.5	0.0
General Physics	Number	1	4	0	3	0	0
	%	12.5	50.0	0.0	37.5	0.0	0.0
Therapy	Number	1	3	0	3	1	0
	%	12.5	37.5	0.0	37.5	12.5	0.0

Table RC-15 .

Graduates' perception of their N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum as preparation for New York State Licensing Examination

Graduates	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Number	1	4	3	1	0
Percent	11.1	44.4	33.3	11.1	0.0

Table RC-16

Graduates' perception of N.Y.C.C.C.
as preparation for each section of New
York State Licensing Examination

Section		Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor	Very Poor
Radiographic Techniques	Number	1	5	3	0	0
	%	11.1	55.6	33.3	0.0	0.0
Standard Positioning	Number	3	3	3	0	0
	%	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0
Anatomy/Physiology	Number	5	2	1	1	0
	%	55.6	22.2	11.1	11.1	0.0
X-Ray Physics	Number	1	2	5	0	1
	%	11.1	22.2	55.6	0.0	11.1
Radiation Therapy	Number	0	3	4	1	1
	%	0.0	33.3	44.4	11.1	11.1
Special Procedures	Number	0	3	2	2	2
	%	0.0	33.3	22.2	22.2	22.2
General Physics	Number	0	3	4	2	0
	%	0.0	33.3	44.4	22.2	0.0
Therapy	Number	0	2	3	2	2
	%	0.0	22.2	33.3	22.2	22.2

Faculty Analysis Section

One component of the evaluation of the Allied Health Learning Division of New York City Community College is an analysis of the faculty, its perceptions, and its instructional methods and techniques. This section of the report of the evaluation considers these factors. The section is divided into three main subsections:

- I. The Faculty
- II. Faculty Perceptions
- III. Instructional Methods and Techniques.

Subsection I provides an analysis of the faculty by department, position, rank, tenure, length of service and prior teaching experience. Number of respondents and percentages are provided where applicable.

Subsection II analyzes faculty perceptions of their department and their students prior to open admissions and currently as well as their perceptions of certification/licensure examination importance, impact of student evaluations on instructional practices, graduates, and examination cheating.

Subsection III is an analysis of current teaching loads for various instructional activities and extent of use of selected instructional techniques.

I. The Faculty

Ninety-three faculty members responded to the questionnaire circulated to obtain data on which this study is based. Faculty were divided by department as shown in Table F-1.

To further determine the composition of faculty respondents, faculty were subdivided by Position, Rank, Tenure, Length of Service, and Prior Teaching Experience. The results of this subdivision are shown in Tables F-2 through F-6. It can be seen from Table F-2 that only four adjunct faculty responded to the questionnaire. Analysis by position, therefore, will not be attempted. Table F-3 shows a normal distribution of faculty by rank; Table F-4 shows an even distribution of faculty by tenure.

Table F-5 showing length of service at N.Y.C.C.C. by department also provides the data to determine that mean length of service is 8.69 years with a standard deviation of 7.5 years. Median length of service is 6.67 years, while maximum is 28 years. Table F-6 provides the data to determine that mean prior teaching experience is 4.95 years with a standard deviation of 6.49 years. Median prior teaching experience is 3.08 years, and maximum is 39 years.

II. Faculty Perceptions

One of the primary purposes of this inquiry was to examine faculty perceptions of their department, their students, the relative importance of licensure/certification (if applicable), and the effects of student evaluation on selected areas of instruction. Faculty were also asked their perceptions of certain factors both before and after open admission. Faculty perceptions have been tabulated and are presented below.

Faculty perceptions of the academic quality of their department, by department, are shown in Tables F-7 and F-8. It can be seen from these two tables that with the exception of the Dental Laboratory and Nursing departments, faculty perceive the academic quality of their departments as having increased since the advent of open admissions. Considering the division as a whole, and eliminating "No Response" category, the percentage of the division responding "Very High" and "High" was 60.2% for perception of academic quality prior to open admissions and 60.0% currently. When analyzed by rank, faculty perception of their departments was evenly dispersed across rank by category.

Tables F-9 through F-11 outline faculty perceptions of academic quality of students prior to open admissions and currently. It is immediately apparent from these tables that there is considerable difference in the perceived academic quality of students by faculty when grouped by department. Prior to open admissions 0.0 percent of Chemical Technology faculty perceived their students as "Very High" or "High" and 83.3%

perceived their students as "Average". During this same period 58.4% of Dental Hygiene faculty perceived their students as "Very High" or "High" and 40% of Nursing faculty perceived their students as "Very High" or "High". In this same period only 8.6% of faculty of the Division perceived their students' academic quality as "Low" and none perceived their students as "Very Low."

There is virtually no change in faculty perceptions of academic quality of students between the period prior to open admissions and the present, both by department subdivision and the division as a whole. Forty-seven percent of division faculty perceived their students to be of "Average" academic quality prior to open admissions and 46.2% currently. There is, however, a significant difference in perceptions of current regular students and open admissions students. Tables F-9 and F-10 show that division faculty perceive the percentage of current regular students rated "Low" and "Very Low" in academic quality to be 15.1%; the percentage of current open admissions students perceived in the same categories is 56.0%. Only 25.8% of open admissions students are perceived as "Average" or "High," while 66.4% of current regular students are perceived as being in these quality categories. Most departments follow the division percentages with the exception of Ophthalmic Dispensing and Radiologic Technology. The percentage of Ophthalmic Dispensing faculty to perceive the academic quality of their students to be "Average" or "High" is 71.4%. The percentage of Radiologic Technology faculty to respond to the same categories is 0.0%.

To determine faculty perceptions of students completing their program and graduates of the Allied Health Division, faculty were asked to respond to questions soliciting this information. Their responses, by department, are tabulated in Tables F-12 and F-13. It can be seen that almost all faculty of Chemical Technology, Dental Hygiene, Dental Laboratory and Medical Laboratory perceive less than 26% of their advanced students to be without adequate preparation, but only 33.3% of the Nursing faculty, 57.2% of the Ophthalmic Dispensing Faculty and 60% of the Radiologic Technology faculty perceive the same percentage of unpreparedness to be true. Fifty-eight percent of the Nursing faculty perceive the unprepared percentage of their students to be between 26% and 100%. Similar results can be seen in Table F-13 which indicates 91.7% of Chemical Technology faculty and 100.0% of Dental Hygiene and Medical Laboratory faculty perceive their graduates to possess necessary knowledge and skill for satisfactory job performance while only 66.7% of Nursing faculty perceive this to be true.

Faculty perceptions of the importance of passing the certification/licensure examination are shown in Table F-14. For those departments whose students must pass a certification/licensing examination prior to obtaining employment in their discipline there is unanimity in the perception that passing the examination is "Extremely" or "Very" important. When queried as to the importance of passing or obtaining a high score in the examination, 81.0% of those respondents from departments whose students must take certification/licensing examinations indicated that "Passing" was most important; only 19.0% perceived "Obtaining a High

Score" to be most important. .

The number and percentage of faculty by department, perceiving any effect of student evaluation on selected instructional components is shown in Table F-15. It can be seen that faculty of Chemical Technology and Dental Laboratory perceive almost no influence of student evaluation while other departments perceive increasing influence in varying degrees. Overall, the division appears to perceive the maximum influence affecting lectures and laboratories; the least affecting seminars and grading. When subdivided by condition of tenure, a statistically significant difference appears between non-tenured and tenured faculty in their perception of effect of student evaluation on lectures, laboratories, and testing. These results are displayed in Table F-16.

The occurrence of cheating on examinations as perceived by faculty is shown in Table F-17. It is apparent that most of the division faculty, 92.5%, perceive cheating occurs "Rarely" or "Sometimes." There is very little discrepancy by department from the overall division perceptions.

Faculty were asked to provide their comments and opinions of weaknesses in the Allied Health program, the manner in which students can be better served by their department, and perceptions of open admissions students. Many comments in the first two categories overlapped and will be grouped for synthesis:

Unprepared students are being admitted

Laboratory classes are too large

Program should be brought up to industry currency

More equipment needed

Laboratory/clinic hours inappropriate

Insufficient clinical experience for students

Department standards should be raised.

The above comments were repeated many times in various ways as were those related to open admissions students:

Inability to read

Extremely poor academic background

Lack of basic skills.

III. Instructional Methods and Techniques

An analysis of the relative amount of time spent in various instructional functions teaching general course related materials, as opposed to teaching specifically for the certification/licensure examination, was made. The results, by teaching function, cross tabulated by department, are shown in Tables F-18 through F-29. The results of this analysis indicate that a significant number of faculty do not utilize seminars or individualized instruction at any time, nor laboratory or evaluation techniques when teaching specifically toward the certification/licensure examinations. The faculty was further subdivided by rank and tenure to determine whether any significant differences in time spent in various instructional functions were related to these variables. When subdivided by tenure, no differences were found. The results of the subdivision by rank are shown in Tables F-30 through F-41. It can be seen in these tables that faculty with the rank of Professor do not use seminars for any instructional function, whereas other faculty make some use of this instructional technique. It can also be seen that considerable portion of the faculty indicate they spend no time on evaluation and testing for any instructional function.

The extensiveness of use of several other instructional techniques was investigated including:

Pass/Fail examinations

Curve grading

Behavioral Objectives

Individualized instruction

Audio/visual media

The results of this investigation divided by department are shown in Tables F-42 through F-46. From these tables it can be seen that there is a wide disparity in the use of all the instructional techniques listed, except individualized instruction, by department. Pass/fail examinations are never used by Chemical Technology and Radiologic Technology departments but are used in varying degrees by up to 50% of other departments. Curve grading is never used by Radiologic Technology but is used in varying degrees by up to 100% of other departments. Behavioral objectives are used "Always" or "Usually" by 100% of the Nursing department and 91% of the Dental Hygiene department but in decreasing amounts to 24% of the Chemical Technology department. Audio/visual media are used "Always" or "Usually" by 80% of the Radiologic Technology department and in decreasing amounts to 0.0% for the Ophthalmic Dispensing department for the same category responses. This should not suggest that the Ophthalmic Dispensing department does not utilize audio/visual media -- 71% of the department indicate they use audio/visual media "Sometimes" -- the prior figures pertain only to the "Always" and "Usually" responses.

To further investigate the patterns of use of the selected instructional techniques the faculty responses were divided by rank. The results are presented in Tables F-47 through F-51. These tables show that the use of the specified instructional techniques is relatively evenly dispersed across rank by response category. There are no significant exceptions to the response patterns.

Table F-1

Faculty Respondents
by Department

Department	Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Number of respondents	12	12	6	20	31	7	5	93
Percentage of respondents	12.9	12.9	6.5	21.5	33.3	7.5	5.4	100.0

Table F-2

Faculty Position
by Department

Department		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Position:									
Full time	Number of respondents	12	11	6	20	31	5	4	89
	Percent. of respondents	12.9	11.8	6.5	21.5	33.3	5.4	4.3	95.7
Adjunct	Number of respondents	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4
	Percent. of respondents	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	1.1	4.3

Table F-3

Faculty Rank by Department

Department		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Rank: Professor	Number of respondents	5	3	1	2	1	1	0	13
	% of respondents	41.7	25.0	16.7	10.0	3.2	14.3	0.0	14.0*
Assoc. Professor	Number of respondents	3	4	2	3	3	1	1	17
	% of respondents	25.0	33.3	33.3	15.0	9.7	14.3	20.0	18.3
Assist. Professor	Number of respondents	4	2	1	7	14	2	2	32
	% of respondents	33.3	16.7	16.7	35.0	45.2	28.6	40.0	34.4
Lecturer	Number of respondents	0	1	0	2	9	2	2	16
	% of respondents	0.0	8.3	0.0	10.0	29.0	28.6	40.0	17.2
Instructor	Number of respondents	0	2	2	6	4	1	0	15
	% of respondents	0.0	16.7	33.3	30.0	12.9	14.3	0.0	16.2

*Percentage of total

Table F-4

Faculty Tenure by Department

Department		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Tenured	Number of respondents	12	7	3	7	12	3	1	45
	% of dept.	100.0	58.3	50.0	35.0	38.7	42.9	20.0	48.4*
Non- tenured	Number of respondents	0	5	3	13	19	4	4	48
	% of dept.	0.0	41.7	50.0	65.0	61.3	57.1	80.0	51.6

*Percentage of total

Table F-5

Faculty Length of Service by Department

Department	Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total	
Length of Service:									
1 year	Number of respondents	0	1	1	5	1	0	1	9
	% of respondents	0.0	8.3	16.7	25.0	3.2	0.0	20.0	9.7*
2 years	Number of respondents	0	0	0	5	1	0	1	7
	% of respondents	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	3.2	0.0	20.0	7.5
3-5 years	Number of respondents	0	2	1	3	13	2	2	23
	% of respondents	0.0	16.7	16.7	15.0	41.9	28.6	40.0	24.7
6-10 years	Number of respondents	5	5	1	5	11	5	1	33
	% of respondents	41.7	41.7	16.7	25.0	35.5	71.4	20.0	35.5
11-20 years	Number of respondents	7	4	3	2	5	0	0	21
	% of respondents	58.3	33.3	50.0	10.0	16.1	0.0	0.0	22.6

* Percentage of total

Table F-6

Faculty Prior Teaching Experience by Department

Department		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Prior Teaching Experience:									
None	Number of respondents:	1	5	2	3	6	6	1	24
	% of dept.	8.3	41.7	33.3	15.0	19.4	85.7	20.0	25.8*
1 year	Number of respondents	2	0	0	3	2	0	1	8
	% of dept.	16.7	0.0	0.0	15.0	6.5	0.0	20.0	8.6
2 years	Number of respondents	2	3	1	3	2	0	0	11
	% of dept.	16.7	25.0	16.7	15.0	6.5	0.0	0.0	11.8
3-5 years	Number of respondents	2	3	3	1	9	1	0	19
	% of dept.	16.7	25.0	50.0	5.0	29.0	14.3	0.0	20.4
6-10 years	Number of respondents	4	1	0	4	9	0	1	19
	% of dept.	33.3	8.3	0.0	20.0	29.0	0.0	20.0	20.4
11-18 years	Number of respondents	1	0	0	4	2	0	0	7
	% of dept.	8.3	0.0	0.0	20.0	6.5	0.0	0.0	7.5
Over 19 years	Number of respondents	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	5
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	3.2	0.0	40.0	5.4

Table F-7

Faculty Perceptions of the academic quality of their department prior to open admissions by department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Optthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Very High	Number	0	4	2	8	1	0	0	15
	% of dept.	0.0	33.3	33.3	40.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	16.1/20.5*
High	Number	6	6	0	5	8	3	1	29
	% of dept.	50.0	50.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	42.9	20.0	31.2/39.7
Average	Number	5	1	1	0	16	4	2	29
	% of dept.	41.7	8.3	16.7	0.0	51.6	57.1	40.0	31.2/39.7
Low	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Very Low	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
No Response	Number	1	1	3	7	6	0	2	20
	% of dept.	8.3	8.3	50.0	35.0	19.4	0.0	40.0	21.5

*Percentage of total/Percentage of responses

Table F-8

Faculty Perception of the academic quality of their department at this time by department.

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Very High	Number	0	9	0	11	3	1	0	24
	% of dept.	0.0	75.0	0.0	55.0	9.7	14.3	0.0	25.8/28.2*
High	Number	6	2	1	6	6	4	2	27
	% of dept.	50.0	16.7	16.7	30.0	19.4	57.1	40.0	29.0/31.8
Average	Number	4	0	2	1	12	2	2	23
	% of dept.	33.0	0.0	33.3	5.0	38.7	28.6	40.0	24.7/27.1
Low	Number	1	0	1	0	9	0	0	11
	% of dept.	8.3	0.0	16.7	0.0	29.0	0.0	0.0	11.8/12.9
Very Low	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
No Response	Number	1	1	2	2	1	0	1	8
	% of dept.	8.3	8.3	33.3	10.0	3.2	0.0	20.0	8.6

*Percentage of total/Percentage of responses

Table F-9

Faculty Perception of academic quality of students prior to open admissions by department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Very High	Number	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	5
	% of dept.	0.0	16.7	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.4*
High	Number	0	5	2	5	2	2	1	17
	% of dept.	0.0	41.7	33.3	25.0	6.5	28.6	20.0	18.3
Average	Number	10	4	1	5	17	5	2	44
	% of dept.	83.3	33.3	16.7	25.0	54.8	71.4	40.0	47.3
Low	Number	1	0	0	0	7	0	0	8
	% of dept.	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.6	0.0	0.0	8.6
Very Low	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
No Response	Number	1	1	3	7	5	0	2	19
	% of dept.	8.3	8.3	50.0	35.0	16.1	0.0	40.0	20.4

* Percentage of total

Table F-10

Faculty Perception of academic quality
of current regular students by department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Very High	Number	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	6
	% of dept.	0.0	33.3	0.0	5.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	6.5*
High	Number	1	6	0	7	1	3	1	19
	% of dept.	8.3	50.0	0.0	35.0	3.2	42.9	20.0	20.4
Average	Number	7	2	3	8	18	2	3	43
	% of dept.	58.3	16.7	50.0	40.0	58.1	28.6	60.0	46.2
Low	Number	3	0	0	2	8	1	0	14
	% of dept.	25.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	25.8	14.3	0.0	15.1
Very Low	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
No Response	Number	1	0	3	2	4	0	1	11
	% of dept.	8.3	0.0	50.0	10.0	12.9	0.0	20.0	11.8

*Percentage of total

Faculty Perception of academic quality of
current open admissions students by
department

Perception		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Very High	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0*
High	Number	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3
	% of dept.	8.3	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	3.2
Average	Number	2	3	2	4	6	4	0	21
	% of dept.	16.7	25.0	33.3	20.0	19.4	57.1	0.0	22.6
Low	Number	6	2	2	12	17	1	2	42
	% of dept.	50.0	16.7	33.3	60.0	54.8	14.3	40.0	45.2
Very Low	Number	2	0	1	1	4	1	1	10
	% of dept.	16.7	0.0	16.7	5.0	12.9	14.3	20.0	10.8
No Response	Number	1	7	1	2	4	0	2	17
	% of dept.	8.3	58.3	16.7	10.0	12.9	0.0	40.0	18.3

*Percentage of total

Table F-12

Faculty Perception of percentage of advanced students without necessary knowledge or skills by department

Percentage		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
0%	Number	3	6	0	4	0	0	0	3
	% of dept.	25.0	50.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2
1-10%	Number	4	5	4	9	3	2	2	4
	% of dept.	33.3	41.7	66.7	45.0	9.7	28.6	40.0	4.3
11-25%	Number	2	0	1	5	7	2	1	19
	% of dept.	16.7	0.0	16.7	25.0	22.6	28.6	20.0	20.4
26-50%	Number	2	0	0	2	13	1	1	18
	% of dept.	16.7	0.0	0.0	10.0	41.9	14.3	20.0	19.4
51-75%	Number	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	29
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.5	28.6	0.0	31.2
76-100%	Number	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	13
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.7	0.0	0.0	13.9
No Response	Number	1	1	1	0	3	0	1	6
	% of dept.	8.3	8.3	16.7	0.0	9.7	0.0	20.0	6.5

Table F-13

Faculty Perception of AHD graduates with necessary knowledge and skill for satisfactory job performance, by department

Perception	Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Number	11	12	4	20	21	6	4	78
Percentage of dept.	91.7	100.0	66.7	100.0	67.7	85.7	80.0	83.9

Table F-14

Faculty Perception of importance of
passing certification/licensure examination
by department

Perception		Chemical Technology*	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory*	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Extremely Important	Number	0	12	1	11	28	5	5	62
	% of dept.	0.0	100.0	16.7	55.0	90.2	71.4	100.0	66.7/84.7**
Very Important	Number	0	0	0	4	3	2	0	9
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	9.8	28.6	0.0	9.7/12.5
Important	Number	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	8
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.6/6.9
Unimpor- tant	Number	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1/0.0
Not Applicable	Number	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	13
	% of dept.	100.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.9/0.0

* Certification/licensing not applicable

** Percentage of total/percentage of certification/licensure department total

Table F-15

Faculty perceiving influence of
student evaluation on selected
instructional components by department

Component		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Lectures	Number	0	5	0	10	12	4	3	34
	% of dept.	0.0	41.7	0.0	50.0	38.7	57.1	60.0	36.6
Seminars	Number	0	1	0	2	4	1	0	8
	% of dept.	0.0	8.3	0.0	10.0	12.9	14.3	0.0	8.6
Labora- tories	Number	0	6	0	9	8	4	2	29
	% of dept.	0.0	50.0	0.0	45.0	25.8	57.1	40.0	31.2
Testing	Number	0	2	0	6	7	1	3	19
	% of dept.	0.0	16.7	0.0	30.0	22.6	14.3	60.0	20.4
Grading	Number	2	0	1	3	3	1	1	11
	% of dept.	16.7	0.0	16.7	15.0	9.7	14.3	20.0	11.8
Individ. Assistance	Number	1	3	0	7	9	2	0	22
	% of dept.	8.3	25.0	0.0	35.0	29.0	28.6	0.0	23.7

Table F-16

Faculty perceiving influence of student
evaluation on selected instructional
components by tenure

Component		Tenured	Non-tenured
Lectures	Number	13	21*
	% of condition	28.9	43.8
Seminars	Number	4	4
	% of condition	8.9	8.3
Labora- tories	Number	9	20*
	% of condition	20.0	41.7
Testing	Number	7	12*
	% of condition	15.6	25.5
Grading	Number	6	5
	% of condition	13.3	10.4
Individ. Assistance	Number	11	11
	% of condition	24.4	22.9

* Chi Square $P < .02$

Table F-17

Faculty Perception of occurrence of cheating on examinations, by department

Occurrence		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Always	Number	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	1.1
Usually	Number	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	16.7	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2
Sometimes	Number	5	10	0	11	2	6	2	54
	% of dept.	41.7	83.3	0.0	55.0	6.4	85.7	40.0	58.1
Rarely	Number	7	2	3	7	9	1	3	32
	% of dept.	58.3	16.7	50.0	35.0	29.0	14.3	60.0	34.4
Never	Number	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
No Response	Number	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	3
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	3.2

Table F-18

Relative faculty use of lectures
for general course material by
department

Percentage of Teaching Load		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
0%	Number	2	6	0	3	6	0	3	20
	% of dept.	16.7	50.0	0.0	15.0	19.4	0.0	60.6	21.5*
1-25%	Number	0	1	5	1	12	1	0	20
	% of dept.	0.0	8.3	83.3	5.0	38.7	14.3	0.0	21.5
26-50%	Number	7	5	0	11	13	1	0	37
	% of dept.	58.3	41.7	0.0	55.0	41.9	14.3	0.0	39.8
51-75%	Number	3	0	0	5	0	2	1	11
	% of dept.	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	28.6	20.0	11.8
76-100%	Number	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	5
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	42.9	20.0	5.4

* Percentage of total

Table F-19

Relative faculty use of lectures
for specific certification exam
material by department

Percentage of Teaching Load		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
0%	Number	12	10	5	18	30	4	5	84
	% of dept.	100.0	83.3	83.3	90.0	96.8	51.1	100.0	90.3*
1-25%	Number	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	4
	% of dept.	0.0	8.3	16.7	5.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	4.3
26-50%	Number	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
51-75%	Number	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
76-100%	Number	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	28.6	0.0	3.2

*Percentage of total

Table F-20

Relative faculty use of seminars for
general course material by department

Percentage of Teaching Load		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
0%	Number	12	11	6	17	22	7	5	80*
	% of dept.	100.0	91.7	100.0	85.0	71.0	100.0	100.0	86.0
1-25%	Number	0	1	0	3	9	0	0	13
	% of dept.	0.0	8.3	0.0	15.0	29.0	0.0	0.0	14.0
26-50%	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
51-75%	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
76-100%	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

* Percentage of total

Table F-21

Relative faculty use of seminars
for specific certification exam
material by department

Percentage of Teaching Load		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Optalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
0%	Number	12	12	6	19	31	6	5	91
	% of dept.	100.0	100.0	100.0	95.0	100.0	85.7	100.0	97.8*
1-25%	Number	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
26-50%	Number	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	1.1
51-75%	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
76-100%	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

*Percentage of total

Table F-22

Relative faculty use of laboratory
for general course material by
department

Percentage of Teaching Load		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
0%	Number	2	1	1	2	3	3	3	15
	% of dept.	16.7	8.3	16.7	10.0	9.7	42.9	60.0	16.1
1-25%	Number	0	0	1	3	0	1	2	7
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	16.7	15.0	0.0	14.3	40.0	7.5
26-50%	Number	7	2	2	12	11	2	0	36
	% of dept.	58.3	16.7	33.3	60.0	35.5	28.6	0.0	38.7
51-75%	Number	3	5	1	2	11	1	0	23
	% of dept.	25.0	41.7	16.7	10.0	35.5	14.3	0.0	24.7
76-100%	Number	0	4	1	1	6	0	0	12
	% of dept.	0.0	33.3	16.7	5.0	19.4	0.0	0.0	12.9

Table F-23

Relative faculty use of laboratory
for specific certification exam
material by department

Percentage of Teaching Load		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
0%	Number	12	7	6	19	31	6	5	86
	% of dept.	100.0	58.3	100.0	95.0	100.0	85.7	100.0	92.5
1-25%	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
26-50%	Number	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	3
	% of dept.	0.0	8.3	0.0	5.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	3.2
51-75%	Number	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
76-100%	Number	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
	% of dept.	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2

Table F-24

Relative faculty use of individualized instruction for general course material by department

Percentage of Teaching Load		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
0%	Number	11	7	1	10	9	4	4	46
	% of dept.	91.7	98.3	16.7	50.0	29.0	57.1	80.0	49.5*
1-25%	Number	1	3	3	8	20	1	1	37
	% of dept.	8.3	25.0	50.0	40.0	64.5	14.3	20.0	39.8
26-50%	Number	0	0	1	2	2	2	0	7
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	16.7	10.0	6.5	28.6	0.0	7.5
51-75%	Number	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
76-100%	Number	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
	% of dept.	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2

*Percentage of total

Table F-25

Relative faculty use of individualized instruction for specific certification exam material by department

Percentage of Teaching Load		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
0%	Number	12	8	6	19	31	6	5	87
	% of dept.	100.0	66.7	100.0	95.0	100.0	85.7	100.0	93.5
1-25%	Number	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
	% of dept.	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2
26-50%	Number	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	2.2
51-75%	Number	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
76-100%	Number	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1

Table F-26

Relative faculty use of evaluation
and testing for general course
material by department

Percentage of Teaching Load		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
0%	Number	7	6	2	9	9	3	3	39
	% of dept.	58.3	50.0	33.3	45.0	29.0	42.9	60.0	41.9*
1-25%	Number	5	6	4	10	22	3	2	52
	% of dept.	41.7	50.0	66.7	50.0	71.0	42.9	40.0	55.9
26-50%	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
51-75%	Number	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	2.2
76-100%	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

* Percentage of total

Table F-27

Relative faculty use of evaluation
and testing for specific certification
exam material by department

Percentage of Teaching Load		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Optthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
0%	Number	12	9	6	19	31	5	5	87
	% of dept.	100.7	75.0	100.0	95.0	100.0	71.4	100.0	93.5*
1-25%	Number	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4
	% of dept.	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	4.3
26-50%	Number	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	1.1
51-75%	Number	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
76-100%	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

* Percentage of total

Table F-28

Relative faculty use of advisement,
library research and administrative
functions for general course material
by department

Percentage of Teaching Load		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Optalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
0%	Number	12	10	6	17	23	5	4	78
	% of dept.	100.0	83.3	100.0	85.0	74.2	85.7	80.0	83.9*
1-25%	Number	0	1	0	2	7	1	0	11
	% of dept.	0.0	8.3	0.0	10.0	22.6	14.3	0.0	11.8
26-50%	Number	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	1.1
51-75%	Number	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
	% of dept.	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	2.2
76-100%	Number	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1

* Percentage of total

Table F-29

Relative faculty use of advisement, library research, and administrative functions for specific certification exam material by department

Percentage of Teaching Load		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Optthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
0%	Number	12	11	6	20	31	7	5	92
	% of dept.	100.0	91.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	98.9*
1-25%	Number	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
26-50%	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
51-75%	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
76-100%	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

* Percentage of total

Table F-30

Relative faculty use of lectures for
general course material by rank

Percentage of Teaching Load		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Instructor
0%	Number	5	2	5	4	4
	% of dept.	38.5	11.8	15.6	25.0	26.7
1-25%	Number	0	5	7	3	5
	% of dept.	0.0	29.4	21.9	18.8	33.3
26-50%	Number	6	7	15	5	4
	% of dept.	46.2	41.2	46.9	31.3	26.7
51-75%	Number	0	2	4	4	1
	% of dept.	0.0	11.8	12.5	25.0	6.7
76-100%	Number	2	1	1	0	1
	% of dept.	15.4	5.9	3.1	0.0	6.7

Table F-31

Relative faculty use of lectures for
specific certification exam material
by rank

Percentage of Teaching Load		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Instructor
0%	Number	10	17	29	14	14
	% of dept.	76.9	100.0	90.6	87.5	93.3
1-25%	Number	2	0	0	1	1
	% of dept.	15.4	0.0	0.0	6.3	6.7
26-50%	Number	0	0	1	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0
51-75%	Number	0	0	0	1	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0
76-100%	Number	1	0	2	0	0
	% of dept.	7.7	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0

Table F-32

Relative faculty use of seminars for
general course material by rank

Percentage of Teaching Load		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Instructor
0%	Number	13	14	27	12	14
	% of dept.	100.0	82.4	84.4	75.0	93.7
1-25%	Number	0	3	5	4	1
	% of dept.	0.0	17.6	15.6	25.0	6.3
26-50%	Number	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
51-75%	Number	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
76-100%	Number	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table F-33

Relative faculty use of seminars
for specific certification exam
material by rank

Percentage of Teaching Load		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Instructor
0%	Number	13	17	32	14	15
	% of dept.	100.0	100.0	100.0	75.0	100.0
1-25%	Number	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
26-50%	Number	0	0	0	1	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0
51-75%	Number	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
76-100%	Number	0	0	0	1	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0

Table F-34

Relative faculty use of laboratories
for general course material by rank

Percentage of Teaching Load		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Instructor
0%	Number	5	2	3	1	4
	% of dept.	38.5	11.8	9.4	6.3	26.7
1-25%	Number	1	0	4	1	1
	% of dept.	7.7	0.0	12.5	6.3	6.3
26-50%	Number	4	6	14	7	5
	% of dept.	30.8	35.3	43.8	43.8	33.3
51-75%	Number	2	5	8	5	3
	% of dept.	15.4	29.4	25.0	31.3	20.0
76-100%	Number	1	4	3	2	2
	% of dept.	7.7	23.5	9.4	12.5	13.3

Table F-35

Relative faculty use of laboratories
for specific certification exam
material by rank

Percentage of Teaching Load		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Instructor
0%	Number	12	16	31	14	13
	% of dept.	92.3	94.1	96.9	87.5	86.7
1-25%	Number	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
26-50%	Number	0	0	1	2	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	3.1	12.5	0.0
51-75%	Number	0	0	0	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7
6-100%	Number	1	1	0	0	1
	% of dept.	7.7	5.9	0.0	0.0	6.7

Table F-36

Relative faculty use of individualized instruction for general course material by rank

Percentage of Teaching Load		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Instructor
0%	Number	10	10	15	2	9
	% of dept.	76.9	58.8	46.9	12.5	60.0
1-25%	Number	2	5	14	12	4
	% of dept.	15.4	29.4	43.8	75.0	26.7
26-50%	Number	1	1	3	2	0
	% of dept.	7.7	5.9	9.4	12.5	0.0
51-75%	Number	0	0	0	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7
76-100%	Number	0	1	0	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	6.7

Table F-37

Relative faculty use of individualized instruction for specific certification exam material by rank

Percentage of Teaching Load		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Instructor
0%	Number	12	16	31	14	14
	% of dept.	92.3	94.1	96.9	87.5	93.3
1-25%	Number	1	0	1	0	0
	% of dept.	7.7	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0
26-50%	Number	0	0	0	2	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0
51-75%	Number	0	0	0	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7
76-100%	Number	0	1	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table F-38

Relative faculty use of evaluation
and testing for general course
material by rank

Percentage of Teaching Load		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Instructor
0%	Number	10	7	9	4	9
	% of dept.	76.9	41.2	28.1	25.0	60.0
1-25%	Number	3	10	23	10	6
	% of dept.	23.1	58.8	71.9	62.5	40.0
26-50%	Number	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
51-75%	Number	0	0	0	2	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0
76-100%	Number	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table F-39

Relative faculty use of evaluation
and testing for specific certification
exam material by rank

Percentage of Teaching Load		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Instructor
0%	Number	12	17	30	14	14
	% of dept.	92.3	100.0	93.8	87.5	93.3
1-25%	Number	1	0	2	0	1
	% of dept.	7.7	0.0	6.2	0.0	6.7
26-50%	Number	0	0	0	1	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0
51-75%	Number	0	0	0	1	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0
76-100%	Number	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table F-40

Relative faculty use of advisement,
library research and administrative
functions for general course material
by rank

Percentage of Teaching Load		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Instructor
0%	Number	11	15	23	14	15
	% of dept.	84.6	88.2	71.9	87.5	100.0
1-25%	Number	0	2	8	1	0
	% of dept.	0.0	11.8	25.0	6.3	0.0
26-50%	Number	0	0	0	1	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0
51-75%	Number	1	0	1	0	0
	% of dept.	7.7	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0
76-100%	Number	1	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table F-41

Relative faculty use of advisement,
library research, and administrative
functions for specific certification
exam material by rank

Percentage of Teaching Load		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Instructor
0%	Number	13	17	31	16	15
	% of dept.	100.0	100.0	96.9	100.0	100.0
1-25%	Number	0	0	1	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0
26-50%	Number	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
51-75%	Number	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
76-100%	Number	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table F-42

Extensiveness of use of pass/fail
examinations by department

Utilization		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing*	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Always	Number	0	0	1	4	8	0	0	13
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	16.7	20.0	25.8	0.0	0.0	13.9*
Usually	Number	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	5
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	16.7	10.0	3.2	14.3	0.0	5.4
Sometimes	Number	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	2.2
Rarely	Number	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	5
	% of dept.	0.0	25.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	5.4
Never	Number	12	6	2	12	18	3	5	58
	% of dept.	100.0	50.0	33.3	60.0	58.0	42.0	100.0	62.4
Not Applicable	Number	0	3	2	1	4	0	0	10
	% of dept.	0.0	25.0	33.3	5.0	12.9	0.0	0.0	10.7

*Percentage of total

Table F-43

Extensiveness of use of curve
grading by department

Utilization		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Always	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Usually	Number	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	4
	% of dept.	8.3	0.0	16.7	5.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	4.3*
Sometimes	Number	4	2	0	1	1	3	0	11
	% of dept.	33.3	16.7	0.0	5.0	3.2	42.9	0.0	11.8
Rarely	Number	6	1	3	6	0	2	0	18
	% of dept.	50.0	8.3	50.0	30.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	19.4
Never	Number	1	7	1	12	28	1	5	55
	% of dept.	8.3	58.3	16.7	60.0	90.3	14.3	100.0	59.1
Not Applicable	Number	0	2	1	0	2	0	0	5
	% of dept.	0.0	16.7	16.7	0.0	6.5	0.0	0.0	5.4

*Percentage of total

Table F-44

Extensiveness of use of behavioral objectives by department

Utilization		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Always	Number	1	10	2	2	29	1	0	45
	% of dept.	8.3	83.3	33.3	10.0	93.5	14.3	0.0	48.4*
Usually	Number	2	1	1	8	2	2	4	20
	% of dept.	16.7	8.3	16.7	40.0	6.5	28.6	80.0	21.5
Sometimes	Number	5	0	1	6	0	1	0	13
	% of dept.	41.7	0.0	16.7	30.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	19.9
Rarely	Number	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3
	% of dept.	8.3	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	3.2
Never	Number	3	0	0	3	0	1	0	7
	% of dept.	25.0	0.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	7.5
Not Applicable	Number	0	1	2	0	0	2	0	5
	% of dept.	0.0	8.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	5.4

* Percentage of total

Table F-45

Extensiveness of use of individualized instruction by department

Utilization		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Always	Number	0	2	2	2	7	1	0	14
	% of dept.	0.0	16.7	33.3	10.0	22.6	14.3	0.0	15.1*
Usually	Number	3	4	2	6	7	2	1	25
	% of dept.	25.5	33.3	33.3	30.0	22.6	28.6	20.0	26.9
Sometimes	Number	5	6	2	9	17	3	2	44
	% of dept.	41.7	50.0	33.3	45.0	54.8	42.9	40.0	47.3
Rarely	Number	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3
	% of dept.	8.3	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	3.2
Never	Number	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	5
	% of dept.	25.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	5.4
Not Applicable	Number	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	2.2

* Percentage of total

Table F-46

Extensiveness of use of audio/visual
media by department

Utilization		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Always	Number	0	5	0	3	5	0	1	14
	% of dept.	0.0	41.7	0.0	15.0	16.1	0.0	20.0	15.1*
Usually	Number	2	2	2	9	8	0	3	26
	% of dept.	16.7	16.7	33.3	45.0	25.8	0.0	60.0	27.9
Sometimes	Number	8	5	2	6	18	5	1	45
	% of dept.	66.7	41.7	33.3	30.0	58.1	71.4	20.0	48.4
Rarely	Number	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	4
	% of dept.	8.3	0.0	16.7	5.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	4.3
Never	Number	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	4
	% of dept.	8.3	0.0	16.7	5.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	4.3
Not Applicable	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

*Percentage of total

Table F-47

Extensiveness of use of pass/fail examinations by rank

Utilization		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Instructor
Always	Number	3	1	3	3	3
	% of dept.	23.1	5.9	9.4	18.8	20.0
Usually	Number	0	3	2	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	17.6	6.2	0.0	0.0
Sometimes	Number	1	0	1	0	0
	% of dept.	7.7	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0
Rarely	Number	1	1	1	1	1
	% of dept.	7.7	5.9	3.1	6.3	6.7
Never	Number	7	12	22	8	9
	% of dept.	53.8	70.6	68.7	50.0	50.0
Not Applicable	Number	1	0	3	4	2
	% of dept.	7.7	0.0	9.4	25.5	13.3

Table F-48

Extensiveness of use of curve
grading by rank

Utilization		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Instructor
Always	Number	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Usually	Number	0	1	1	1	1
	% of dept.	0.0	5.9	3.1	6.3	6.7
Sometimes	Number	3	1	5	0	2
	% of dept.	23.1	5.9	15.6	0.0	13.3
Rarely	Number	6	4	5	1	2
	% of dept.	46.2	23.5	15.6	6.3	13.3
Never	Number	4	1	2	1	8
	% of dept.	30.8	64.7	65.6	68.8	53.3
Not Applicable	Number	0	0	0	3	2
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	13.3

Table F-49

Extensiveness of use of behavioral objectives by rank

Utilization		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Instructor
Always	Number	6	9	15	10	5
	% of dept.	46.2	52.9	46.9	62.5	33.3
Usually	Number	3	4	4	3	6
	% of dept.	23.1	23.5	12.5	18.8	40.0
Sometimes	Number	3	1	7	1	1
	% of dept.	23.1	5.9	21.9	6.3	6.7
Rarely	Number	0	1	1	1	0
	% of dept.	0.0	5.9	3.1	6.3	0.0
Never	Number	1	1	4	0	1
	% of dept.	7.7	5.9	12.5	0.0	6.7
Not Applicable	Number	0	1	1	1	2
	% of dept.	0.0	5.9	3.1	6.3	13.3

Table F-50

Extensiveness of use of individual instruction by rank

Utilization		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Instructor
Always	Number	0	1	4	4	5
	% of dept.	0.0	5.9	12.5	25.0	33.3
Usually	Number	4	7	8	4	2
	% of dept.	30.8	41.2	25.0	25.0	13.3
Sometimes	Number	8	7	17	7	5
	% of dept.	61.5	41.2	53.1	43.8	33.3
Rarely	Number	0	1	1	1	0
	% of dept.	0.0	5.9	3.1	6.3	0.0
Never	Number	1	1	2	0	1
	% of dept.	7.7	5.9	6.3	0.0	6.7
Not Applicable	Number	0	0	0	0	2
	% of dept.	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.3

Table F-51

Extensiveness of use of audio/visual
media by rank

Utilization		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Instructor
Always	Number	3	4	3	2	2
	% of dept.	23.1	23.5	9.4	12.5	13.3
Usually	Number	3	2	13	3	5
	% of dept.	23.1	11.8	40.6	18.8	33.3
Sometimes	Number	4	9	14	11	7
	% of dept.	30.8	52.9	43.8	68.8	46.7
Rarely	Number	1	1	2	0	0
	% of dept.	7.7	5.9	6.3	0.0	0.0
Never	Number	2	1	0	0	1
	% of dept.	15.1	5.9	0.0	0.0	6.7
Not Applicable	Number	0	0	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Employer Perception Section

In any training endeavor the ultimate measure of the quality of the training is the ability of the trainees to perform the tasks for which they were trained. Within the Allied Health field the "ability to perform" is, in some cases, certified by the state, or some licensing entity, but actual employment conditions usually provide a much more stringent test of the trainees' knowledge and ability.

Three-hundred-fifty employers of graduates of the Allied Health Division of New York City Community College were asked to provide their perceptions of the knowledge and ability of the graduates. Thirty-two responses were received, twenty-one from present or past employers of graduates. The data herein is based on their responses.

Tables EP-1 and EP-2 provide data showing the number of present and past employers of graduates of the Allied Health Division of New York City Community College (N.Y.C.C.C.) by number of present or past graduate employees and department. It can be seen from these tables that the greatest response was received from employers of Dental Hygiene graduates.

Tables EP-3 and EP-4 present the employers' perceptions of N.Y.C.C.C. graduates referenced to the average entry level employee of the employer. Although responses within each department are too few to be reliable, responses across departments indicate that 23.8% of current employers perceive all N.Y.C.C.C. graduates to be superior to average entry level employees and an additional 52% of current employers to perceive some or most N.Y.C.C.C. graduates to be superior to the average entry level employee. Table EP-4, however, indicates that at least 23.8% of current employers perceive some N.Y.C.C.C. graduates to be inferior to the average entry level employee.

Employers were asked to compare the number of hours of in-service training provided to average new employees and new N.Y.C.C.C. employees. Responses indicated no typical training period, but varied from 3 hours (an employer of a Dental Hygiene graduate) to 1500 hours (an employer of an Ophthalmic Dispensing graduate). Of the twenty-one employers who responded, two indicated N.Y.C.C.C. graduates required more in-service

training than their average new employee. The employers who indicate more than average training is required for N.Y.C.C.C. graduates are currently employing Nursing graduates; the employers who indicate less than average training is required for N.Y.C.C.C. graduates are currently employing Medical Laboratory, Ophthalmic Dispensing, and Radiologic Technology graduates.

Tables EP-5 through EP-12 present employers' perceptions of twenty employee characteristics, and an overall employee rating, of N.Y.C.C.C. graduate employees, across departments and by department. It can be seen from Table EP-5 that 27.1% of respondents perceive N.Y.C.C.C. graduates to be Excellent in employee characteristics and an additional 44.5% perceive graduates to be Very Good or Good in employee characteristics. Characteristics on which graduates rated particularly strong include Punctuality, Organizational Loyalty, and Personal Appearance. Characteristics on which graduates rated particularly weak include Technical Knowledge, Theoretical Knowledge and Communication Skills, Written. Tables EP-6 through EP-12, showing present employers' perceptions of employee characteristics by department, may contain too few responses to be reliable, but are included herein for information value.

Employers were requested to indicate reasons for unsatisfactory performance termination of N.Y.C.C.C. graduate employment, if applicable. Three Dental Hygiene graduate employers responded indicating the following reasons:

Technical Competence

Technical Knowledge

Manipulative Skills

Adaptability (2)

Peer Relationships

Supervisor Relationships

Client-Patient Relationships (2)

Cooperation.

One Radiologic Technology graduate employer responded indicating the employee had been "unable to pass license exam."

Most employers indicated they do expect to employ future N.Y.C.C.C. graduates except for two Nursing department employers who stated they will emphasize baccalaureate degree entry requirements for the foreseeable future. Employers commented on the need to teach "basics" during the students' N.Y.C.C.C. training, the need for stressing accuracy, and the need for practical or clinical practice.

Table EP-1

Number of N.Y.C.C.C. graduates employed
by respondents, by department

Graduates Employed	Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
None	2	1	3	2	1	1	3	13
One	1	5	1	0	1	1	1	10
Two	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	4
Three	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3
Over Three	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Total Number of Current Employers	1	6	1	3	4	1	3	

Table EP-2

Number of N.Y.C.C.C. graduates
previously employed by
respondents, by department

Graduates Previously Employed	Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
None	0	2	4	5	4	1	3	19
1 - 3	1	3	0	1	0	1	2	8
4 - 6	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
7 - 10	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Over ten	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Total number of employers	1	5	0	2	1	1	3	

Table EP-3

Employers' perceptions of number of N.Y.C.C.C. graduates superior to average entry level employee, by department

		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
None	Number	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	40.0	19.0*
Very Few	Number	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	4.8
Some	Number	0	2	0	3	0	1	2	8
	%	0.0	33.3	0.0	75.0	0.0	100.0	40.0	38.0
Most	Number	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	3
	%	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	14.3
All	Number	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	5
	%	0.0	33.3	100.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	23.8

* Percent of total

Table EP-4

Employers' perceptions of number of N.Y.C.C.C. graduates inferior to average entry level employee, by department

		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Laboratory	Medical Laboratory	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
None	Number	0	3	1	4	1	0	* 3	12
	%	0.0	50.0	100.0	100.0	25.0	0.0	60.0	57.1*
Very Few	Number	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	3
	%	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	20.0	14.3
Some	Number	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	5
	%	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	25.0	100.0	20.0	23.8
Most	Number	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	4.8
All	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

* Percent of total

Table EP-5

Employers' perception of N.Y.C.C.C.
graduates' employee characteristics

Characteristics	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Acceptable	Doesn't Apply
Technical competency	5	5	5	5	1	-	-
Technical knowledge	5	4	6	6	2	-	-
Theoretical knowledge	3	4	4	5	3	-	-
Manipulative skills	6	4	6	3	2	-	-
Communication skills, oral	5	2	8	4	2	-	-
Communication skills, written	4	2	5	4	4	-	2
Mathematic competency	2	3	2	3	4	-	4
Basic science background	6	2	7	3	3	-	-
Adaptability	3	8	5	1	0	1	-
Responsibility	7	6	3	2	3	-	-
Reliability	7	6	4	3	1	-	-
Punctuality	6	8	5	1	1	-	-
Peer relationships	7	6	5	3	0	-	-
Supervisor relationships	6	4	5	3	2	-	-
Client/patient relationships	6	3	5	3	0	-	-

(continued next page)

(Table EP-5 continued)

Characteristics	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Acceptable	Doesn't Apply
Initiative	4	7	3	3	3	-	-
Cooperation	6	6	3	3	1	-	-
Enthusiasm	7	5	5	3	1	-	-
Organizational loyalty	9	4	4	1	2	-	-
Personal appearance	10	3	5	3	0	-	-
Overall rating	6	6	4	4	1	-	-
Number of responses (not including "overall rating")	114	92	95	57	35	1	6
Percentage of respondents	27.1	21.9	22.6	13.6	8.3	0.2	1.4

Employers' perceptions of
Chemical Technology graduates'
employee characteristics

Characteristics	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Acceptable	Doesn't Apply
Technical competency			1				
Technical knowledge			1				
Theoretical knowledge				1			
Manipulative skills			1				
Communication skills, oral			1				
Communication skills, written							1
Mathematic competency							1
Basic science background			1				
Adaptability							
Responsibility			1				
Reliability		1					
Punctuality		1					
Peer relationships	1						
Supervisor relationships		1					
Client/patient relationships							1

(continued next page)

(Table EP-6 continued)

Characteristics	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Acceptable	Doesn't Apply
Initiative				1			
Cooperation		1					
Enthusiasm			1				
Organizational loyalty			1				
Personal appearance			1				
Overall rating			1				

Employers' perceptions of Dental
Hygiene graduates' employee
characteristics

Characteristics	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Acceptable	Doesn't Apply
Technical competency	2	2	1	1			
Technical knowledge	2	1		2	1		
Theoretical knowledge	1	2	1	1	1		
Manipulative skills	3	1	2				
Communication skills, oral	1	2	2	1			
Communication skills, written	1	1		2	1		1
Mathematic competency		2	1				3
Basic science background	1	1	3		1		
Adaptability		6					
Responsibility	4	1		1			
Reliability	4	1	1				
Punctuality	3	3					
Peer relationships	2	3	1				
Supervisor relationships	1	2	1		2		
Client/patient relationships	2	3	1				

338

(continued next page)

(Table EP-7 continued)

Characteristics	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Acceptable	Doesn't Apply
Initiative	1	3		1	1		
Cooperation	4	2					
Enthusiasm	3	2	1				
Organizational loyalty	5	1					
Personal appearance	5	1					
Overall rating	2	3		1			

Employers' perceptions of Dental
Laboratory graduates' employee
characteristics

Characteristics	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Acceptable	Doesn't Apply
Technical competency	1						
Technical knowledge	1						
Theoretical knowledge		1					
Manipulative skills	1						
Communication skills, oral	1						
Communication skills, written	1						
Mathematic competency							
Basic science background	1						
Adaptability	1						
Responsibility	1						
Reliability	1						
Punctuality	1						
Peer relationships	1						
Supervisor relationships	1						
Client/patient relationships	1						

(Table EP-8 continued)

Characteristics	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Acceptable	Doesn't Apply
Initiative	1						
Cooperation	1						
Enthusiasm	1						
Organizational loyalty	1						
Personal appearance	1						
Overall rating	1						

Employers' perceptions of
Medical Laboratory graduates'
employee characteristics

Characteristics	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Acceptable	Doesn't Apply
Technical competency	1	2	1				
Technical knowledge	1	1	2				
Theoretical knowledge	1	1		2			
Manipulative skills	1	2	1				
Communication skills, oral	1		3				
Communication skills, written	1		3				
Mathematic competency	1		1	2			
Basic science background	1		1	2			
Adaptability	1	2	1				
Responsibility	1	2	1				
Reliability	1	2	1				
Punctuality	1	2	1				
Peer relationships	1	2		1			
Supervisor relationships	2		1				
Client/patient relationships	2		1				

342

(continued next page)

(Table EP-9 continued)

Characteristics	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Acceptable	Doesn't Apply
Initiative	1	2	1				
Cooperation	1	2	1				
Enthusiasm	1	2	1				
Organizational loyalty	2	1	1				
Personal appearance	1	2	1				
Overall rating							

Employers' perceptions of
Nursing graduates' employee
characteristics

Characteristics	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Acceptable	Doesn't Apply
Technical competency	1			2	1		
Technical knowledge	1			2	1		
Theoretical knowledge	1		1	1	1		
Manipulative skills	1			1	2		
Communication skills, oral	1			2	1		
Communication skills, written	1		1	1	1		
Mathematic competency	1				3		
Basic science background	1		2		1		
Adaptability	1		1	1		1	
Responsibility	1				3		
Reliability	1			2	1		
Punctuality	1		1	1	1		
Peer relationships	1		2	1			
Supervisor relationships	1		1	2			
Client/patient relationships	1		1	2			

311

(continued next page)

(Table EP-10 continued)

Characteristics	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Acceptable	Doesn't Apply
Initiative	1			2	1		
Cooperation	1			2	1		
Enthusiasm	1			1	1		
Organizational loyalty	2			2	1		
Personal appearance	1		1	2			
Overall rating	1			2	1		

Employers' perceptions of
Ophthalmic Dispensing graduates'
employee characteristics

Characteristics	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Acceptable	Doesn't Apply
Technical competency				1			
Technical knowledge				1			
Theoretical knowledge			1				
Manipulative skills				1			
Communication skills, oral				1			
Communication skills, written				1			
Mathematic competency					1		
Basic science background			1				
Adaptability			1				
Responsibility			1				
Reliability			1				
Punctuality			1				
Peer relationships			1				
Supervisor relationships			1				
Client/patient relationships			1				

(continued next page)

(Table EP-11 continued)

Characteristics	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Acceptable	Doesn't Apply
Initiative			1				
Cooperation			1				
Enthusiasm			1				
Organizational loyalty			1				
Personal appearance			1				
Overall rating			1				

Employers' perceptions of
Radiologic Technology graduates'
employee characteristics

Characteristics	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Acceptable	Doesn't Apply
Technical competency		1	2	1			
Technical knowledge		1	2	1			
Theoretical knowledge		1	2		1		
Manipulative skills		1	2	1			
Communication skills, oral	1		2		1		
Communication skills, written		1	1		1		
Mathematic competency		1		1	1		
Basic science background		1		1	1		
Adaptability	2		2				
Responsibility		2	1	1			
Reliability		2	1	1			
Punctuality		2	2				
Peer relationships	1	1	1	1			
Supervisor relationships	1	1	1	1			
Client/patient relationships	2		1	1			

(continued next page)

(Table EP-12 continued)

Characteristics	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Acceptable	Doesn't Apply
Initiative		2	1		1		
Cooperation	1	1	1	1			
Enthusiasm	1	1	1	1			
Organizational loyalty	1	1	1		1		
Personal appearance	1	1	1	1			
Overall rating	1	1	1	1			

ALLIED HEALTH LEARNING CENTER Section

Introduction

The Allied Health Learning Center (AHLC) provides various services to students and faculty of New York City Community College, and has been providing these services for over two years. During this period some of the original functions of AHLC were modified, others were added, and many clients, both student and faculty, were served.

Service may vary both quantitatively and qualitatively and may be evaluated in many ways, but primarily it must provide the client with the results desired with a minimum of extraneous effort, time, and procedural waste. This report provides the results of an evaluation of the services provided to students and faculty by AHLC.

Index to AHLC Subsection**Page****Introduction****History (AHLC and Allied Health Division)****Method and Organization of the Study****Description of AHLC Clients****Patterns of Utilization****Perceived Effectiveness of AHLC****Synthesis and Implication****Tables**

BACKGROUND OF AHLC

Many facets of education have become highly systematized, and with systemization has come specialization and technology to assist in both smoothing process flow and diminishing system input deficits. This phenomenon is particularly apparent in community colleges where all manners of specialized functions and technological assistance are employed to assure process success: graduation of an individual meeting at least the minimum academic standards of the institution. Difficult as the educational process is, the difficulty is intensely aggravated by extreme heterogeneity of process input, that is, the diverse proficiency in basic skills possessed by entering students. A comprehensive support system is required to reduce the degenerative effects of wide variation of student skills. The Allied Health Learning Center (AHLC) of New York City Community College was established during the 1972-1973 academic year to provide such support for the Division of Allied Health and Natural Sciences.

The Division is one of four divisions at New York City Community College and consists of approximately 1800 students and 180 faculty. The Health Services programs currently offered by the Division are:

- Chemical Technology
- Dental Hygiene
- Dental Laboratory Technology
- Medical Laboratory Technology
- Nursing
- Ophthalmic Dispensing
- Radiologic Technology.

AHLC has developed and implemented methods and techniques to increase the probability of academic success of students in the Division. Additionally, materials have been developed to assist faculty in achieving instructional goals. The major services of AHLC are:

1. Preparation of Instructional Aids --
primarily a faculty assistance service, includes assistance in development and preparation of charts, transparencies, models, slides, etc.
2. Student Services --
includes freshman learning skills program, effective reading program, open learning lab, peer futuring, adjunct tutoring, and certification study seminars
3. Faculty Workshops --
for Division faculty; given by AHLC personnel and/or outside consultants
4. Student Record Services --
for department chairmen, advisors, etc.; includes record review, computerized student reporting, etc.
5. Audio/Visual Equipment --
includes supplying audio/visual equipment to faculty on request.

ORGANIZATION

To reduce student skill variation in Allied Health programs, the Allied Health Learning Center provides training and remediation in freshman learning skills and reading in addition to open learning labs, study guides, certification seminars; and assistance to the faculty for development of instructional aids, faculty workshops, student record services, etc. The research reported herein examines clients of the Allied Health Learning Center (AHLC), their utilization patterns, perceived effectiveness of the Center, and provides a synthesis of open ended responses and suggestions. The results reported are in four sections:

Analysis of AHLC clients

Patterns of utilization

Perceived effectiveness

Synthesis and comments.

Sections IV, V, and VI are further divided into two subsections:

A. Faculty

B. Student.

All data herein have been obtained from questionnaires completed by faculty and students in the Allied Health Division of N.Y.C.C.C. It is assumed that respondents are representative of the entire faculty and student body of the division. Possible sampling errors should be considered when examining the data. All tables will be found in the appendix.

Analysis of AHLC Clients

A. Faculty

A total of 92 members of the faculty responded to the AHLC questionnaire. These faculty members were divided by department, position, rank and tenure as shown in Tables 1 through 4, and by position, rank and tenure, cross tabulated by department in Tables 5 through 7. Two additional factors were considered relative to faculty interaction with AHLC: length of service at N.Y.C.C.C. and prior teaching experience. This data is shown in Tables 8 and 9.

B. Students

A total of 495 questionnaires were received from student respondents. Of these, 52 were discarded because respondents listed their departments as other than Allied Health Division departments (secretarial science, liberal arts, etc.), leaving a valid sample of 443 students. As stated above no responses were received from students of Ophthalmic Dispensing. Students were divided by department as shown in Table 10. Students were further subdivided by attendance category, enrollment pattern, year of graduation, year of start, age, and credits transferred into N.Y.C.C.C. This information is presented in Tables 11 through 16. Additional demographic information relative to prior experience and employment was requested of respondents. This information is presented in Tables 17 and 18.

Patterns of Utilization

A. Faculty

For this investigation the various services of AHLC were divided into five major categories:

1. Preparation of Instructional Aids
2. Student Services, including certification seminars, freshman learning skills program, effective reading program, open learning lab (student assistance, faculty and graduate assistance)
3. Student Record Services (record review, computerized student reporting)
4. Use of audio/visual equipment
5. Faculty workshops

Faculty use and/or recommendation of the above AHLC services, by department, were as shown in Table 19. Faculty use of AHLC services was further analyzed by rank, tenure, and length of service. These results, with percentages of category are as shown in Tables 20, 21, and 22. It can be seen from Tables 20, 21, and 22 that, with statistically insignificant fluctuations, faculty use of AHLC services increases, with rank and tenure, and, to some extent, with length of service. A mean of approximately 71% of all responding professors utilize AHLC services with 100% of all responding professors indicating they use and/or recommend AHLC Student Services. The percentage of responding faculty using AHLC services decreases to 48.56% for instructors. Faculty use of AHLC services decreases from 65.22% for tenured respondents to 56.96% for non-tenured respondents.

A similar pattern, although not as definitive, can be seen in Table 22 showing AHLC services utilization by length of service. Responding faculty with one year service use AHLC services 42.65%. The utilization increases sharply to 62.86% in the second year of faculty service and remains within 10% of that figure with continued longevity.

A principal service of AHLC is to provide aid to students with academic problems. An investigation was made as to whether faculty recommended the services of AHLC to such students. The results are shown in Tables 23 through 26. It can be seen that almost all categories of faculty make extensive use of AHLC remedial services. The sole exception is Dental Laboratory faculty whose utilization rate is 33.3%.

A function of AHLC specifically available to faculty is that of modular instruction development for both classroom and independent study use. An investigation of the utilization of this function provided results as shown in Tables 27 through 30. Nursing and Ophthalmic Dispensing faculty appear to make far greater use of AHLC facilities for modular instruction development than any other department. No other pattern of utilization by faculty subdivision is indicated.

Another measure of AHLC utilization, the number of professional contacts between faculty and AHLC personnel per semester was investigated. The results are shown in Tables 31 through 34. It is apparent that mean numbers of professional contacts between faculty and AHLC personnel, per semester, vary widely on all faculty subdivisions:

- by Department - from a low of 2.5 (Dental Laboratory) to a high of 7.1 (Ophthalmic Dispensing)
- by Tenure - from a low of 2.5 (Non-tenured) to a high of 5.7 (Tenured)
- by Rank - from a low of 2.2 (Lecturer) to a high of 6.8 (Professor)
- by Length of Service - from a low of 1.6 (1 year) to a high of 5.3 (11-30 years)

Since there is a relatively high correlation* between Length of Service, Rank and Tenure, it is not unexpected that these three faculty subdivisions would provide the same relationships with mean number of AHLC personnel contacts. The wide disparity in contacts by department does not present such obvious relationships.

To determine whether utilization of AHLC services were largely a result of knowledge of availability of those services or some other factor or factors, faculty awareness of AHLC services was investigated. The results are shown in Tables 35 through 38. In each faculty subdivision, with the single exception of Dental Laboratory in the Department subdivision, the percentage of the subdivision having moderate to complete awareness of available AHLC services is 60 to 100 percent. With the same exception, no faculty subdivision exceeds 20% in the percentage that claim no awareness of available AHLC services.

*
Pearson $r = 0.79$, $P > 0.001$

B. Students

Of the five major categories of AHLC service, one interacts directly with students: Student Services. In this study four components of Student Services were investigated for student utilization:

1. Freshman Learning Skills Program
2. Effective Reading Program
3. Open Lab Program
4. Certification Seminars

In order to become aware of the services available to them at AHLC, students generally require an explanation of those services and/or a recommendation of the services. The pattern of explanation/recommendation of AHLC by department is shown in Tables 39 through 44. It is apparent from Tables 39 through 44 that most students become familiar with AHLC services available to them from explanations and recommendations by their instructors. Table 39 indicates a total of 66.4% of students receive explanation of the services from their instructors. If Dental Laboratory Department students, who apparently have very little contact with AHLC, are not included in the computations, the percentage of students receiving explanation of AHLC services from their instructors becomes approximately 70%.

Actual use of AHLC services by students is provided in Tables 45 through 50. From the data in these tables it can be seen that AHLC serves at least 25% of Allied Health Division students in at least 3 of its Student Services subcategories. Additionally, the low percentage shown for students attending Certification seminars may reflect circumstance that those students most

likely to have attended certification seminars, those students currently graduating, probably did not receive questionnaires to complete.

In order to further investigate patterns of utilization, a series of Chi Square procedures were performed on the factors of source of explanation/recommendation of AHLC services and attendance at AHLC programs. The results are shown in Table 51. The Chi Square statistic is an indication of one (or more) groups' deviation from a "no difference" condition on some measure, and the Probability (P) indicates the relative certainty that deviation was caused by chance factors alone. In condition #1 above it is shown that those students whose instructors explained the services available at AHLC attended Freshman Skills Lab to a significantly greater level than did those whose instructors did not. The probability that this greater attendance level was caused by chance factors alone is less than 0.0000. Condition #2, above, shows that when instructors recommended AHLC services, the attendance level is even greater. These same relationships hold true to a lesser extent, for Student Personnel Services Counselors, and, to the same extent, for Department Academic Advisors. The effect of advising and/or recommending on Open Lab attendance is considerably smaller but still significant. There is no effect of advising and/or recommending on Certification Seminar attendance, most likely for the reasons stated in the remarks concerning Tables 45 through 50.

Perceived Effectiveness of AHLC Services

A. Faculty

Perceived effectiveness, of student and faculty services of AHLC, by members of faculty has been investigated as a part of this research. Faculty were questioned about their assessment of the value and usefulness of each major category of AHLC service and several subcategories of those services.

The results, shown in Tables 52 through 60, indicate number of faculty responding to each category. Percentages are based on number of faculty that reported actual use of each service. Because there were no significant deviations from faculty subdivision percentages, results are reported for the division as a whole. "Not Applicable" responses are not reported.

In each response in Table 52 (except "red tape"), 75% to 90% of the users of Instructional Aid Preparation Service believed the service was Always or Usually helpful.

From the data in Table 53 it can be seen that over 90% of the reporting faculty believe that student learning was increased as a result of Instructional Aids prepared by AHLC.

For each of the subcategories analyzed in Table 54, approximately 80% of faculty responding to the questions believe the service to be necessary Always or Usually. In each case, however, a slightly smaller percentage believe the service to be effectively provided Always or Usually. When

queried as to the advisability of expanding Student Services of AHLC, 45 faculty, 63.4% of those responding, were in favor of such expansion.

It can be seen from the data in Table 55 that a considerably smaller percentage of faculty utilize Student Record Services than use most other AHLC services. Although 39.1% of faculty report using these services (Table 19) only 28.3% of faculty responded to this section of the questionnaire. These services are perceived very effective by over 90% of the users in every aspect except "sufficient detail" where the percentage drops to 80%.

87.5% of responding faculty believe Student Record Services of AHLC facilitated their efforts in student placement.

It can be seen in Tables 56 and 57 that both the perceived effectiveness and benefits of AHLC A/V Equipment Services are high. Over 90% of responding faculty perceive the scheduling and mechanical quality of the equipment to be satisfactory and over 80% believe that increased student learning is attributable to the use of the A/V Equipment Services.

If the No Opinion responses in Table 58 are assumed not to have attended the workshop in question, the percentage of faculty perceiving Faculty Workshops of AHLC to be Very Useful or Somewhat Useful is approximately 75%.

It can be seen from Table 59 that 85% to 95% of those faculty utilizing AHLC Modular Instruction Services believed it to be Always or Usually effective.

To investigate perceived effectiveness of AHLC as a unit, one of the final questions asked of faculty was their rating of AHLC value to students and faculty of N.Y.C.C.C. This question was asked toward the end of the questionnaire to allow faculty the opportunity of reviewing their perceptions while answering questions about individual AHLC services. The results of this question, by department and total faculty are shown in Table 60. It can be seen from Table 60 that 64.2% of all responding faculty consider AHLC services Extremely Valuable or Very Valuable, and 34.6% consider the services Somewhat Valuable. Only one individual respondent considers AHLC services Not Valuable.

B. Students

Perceived effectiveness by Allied Health Division students of various subcategories of Student Services was investigated as a part of this study. Students were surveyed to determine their belief as to the help and/or improvement gained as a result of using the service. Results are provided in Tables 61 through 66. In each table, percentages are based on those students using the service and responding to the question.

It can be seen from Table 61 that approximately 71% of those students attending the Freshman Learning Skills Program believe the program increased their reading skill and improved their study skills, and 83% believed the program was providing a necessary service. As is shown in Table 62, approximately 70% of those students attending the Effective Reading Program believed their reading rate and comprehension was improved, and 76% believed the program was providing a necessary service. In both of these instances,

however, a smaller percentage believed the program increased their confidence in their ability. Confidence in one's ability and/or awareness of one's confidence may not be a function of an improvement in that ability, but may be related to success when using that ability competitively.

Table 63 indicates that approximately 80% of students attending the Open Lab Program believed assistance obtained was sufficient and helpful. Table 64 provides information that while only 10 students responding to the questionnaire attended certification seminars, 80% believed them to increase knowledge in specific subject areas. Of those students responding, 45% plan to attend future seminars.

Tables 65 and 66 provide an indication of student beliefs as to responsiveness and effectiveness of AHLC in toto. Approximately 70% of those students responding believe AHLC is responsive to student needs all or some of the time and 84% believe AHLC is somewhat, very or extremely helpful.

Synthesis and Comments

As might be anticipated, faculty were considerably more expressive than students in open ended responses, but a sufficient number of responses were obtained from both groups to justify an analysis. There were, of course, a great many comments from both faculty and students expressing appreciation for assistance provided by AHLC, for the quality of that assistance, and for the time and effort expended in behalf of many individuals. The overall acceptance and appreciation of AHLC has been documented in Section III: 64% of faculty and 84% of students are shown to believe services of AHLC are valuable and useful. This section, therefore, must not be construed as censure of what is obviously a well accepted and valued service, but is a compilation of the suggestions, comments, and a few criticisms.

Because ultimately the function of AHLC is to increase students' learning, both indirectly through faculty assistance and directly through various student programs, it is appropriate to initially examine student comment and use the analysis of their comments as a base to discuss faculty remarks. Students, and their comments, can be divided into two groups, and each primary group divided into two subgroups. The basic groups are, obviously, those who used AHLC services and those who didn't. The students who did not use AHLC services did not do so for two reasons, the basis for subdivision: those who believe they did not need AHLC services and those who never knew about AHLC services. The students who did use AHLC services can be subdivided into those who attended voluntarily, believe they were helped, and desire additional functions to be made a part of AHLC; and those who attended under duress and have only criticism of AHLC.

Those students who did not utilize AHLC because they believe they did not need additional help provided many favorable comments about AHLC, comments usually based on the help provided to friends and/or fellow classmates. These comments included "helpful for those with problems," "help when needed," and similar remarks. This subdivision of students provided a large percentage of the "Very Helpful" and "Somewhat Helpful" responses to the questionnaire item pertaining to overall effectiveness of AHLC. Even though these students may never have visited AHLC they were well aware of the help AHLC was providing to their peers in academic difficulty.

Students who did not utilize AHLC because they did not know about AHLC were more than a small minority and lead one to believe that AHLC's existence may be one of the better kept secrets at N.Y.C.C.C. Comments from this subgroup included "Never heard of AHLC," "no knowledge of seminars," "instructors should tell us about these programs," and the plaintive "where were you when I needed you?" These students represent those who could be helped if a systematic and consistent path of communication could be established between AHLC and the student body, without bypassing the faculty.

Students who attended AHLC and attended voluntarily are those who provided the most positive responses as to the effectiveness of AHLC, and also the most constructive criticism. Comments included "need more people to help," "need more tutors for specific subjects," "should have films for each subject," "should have more tapes," and "should provide a place to type reports."

These comments indicate acceptance of AHLC as a student oriented study center and the belief that it should be expanded to include many of the functions of a multi-media library.

Students who attended AHLC involuntarily were, for the most part, quite bitter about the experience. Most of this subgroup appear to be Dental Hygiene students and they provided 64% of the "Not Very Helpful" and "Useless" responses to the questionnaire item pertaining to perceived effectiveness of AHLC. Their comments ranged from mild: "too noisy" and "sometimes very boring," through moderately antagonistic: "no one there who knows anything," to outright hostility: "a complete waste of time," and "close it down." A large number of this subgroup believe that compulsory attendance is an encroachment on their personal time which would be better spent studying individually.

With the above analysis of student comments and beliefs about AHLC as a reference, faculty comments can be examined and discussed. The most often repeated comment appeared as response to questionnaire items pertaining to expanded and improved Student Services: increased and expanded tutoring services. Among the suggestions were:

- More individual assistance
- Saturday and Sunday tutoring sessions
- Increased daily hours of operation
- Manual skills tutoring
- Professional tutors

Rotating faculty as tutors
 Technical language tutoring
 Tutoring for non-English speaking students
 Mandatory tutorial attendance.

All suggestions except the final one concur with student beliefs about utilization of AHLC Student Services. Mandatory AHLC attendance by students will probably not achieve increased learning. AHLC attendance should be perceived as both voluntary and valuable by students prior to their initial attendance; from that point on AHLC should be interesting and effective to maintain attendance.

Many suggestions for additional AHLC services were received from faculty.

These included:

Reports to faculty recommending students as to students' progress, services used, attendance, etc.

Published list of available services

Published list of A/V aids for each department

Additional departmentally oriented A/V aids

Student academic counseling

Separate departmentally oriented tutoring laboratories

Pre-acceptance interview for applicants with learning difficulties

These suggestions for expanded AHLC services also concur with students' perception of AHLC as a multi-purpose learning laboratory and additionally reflect the lack of general knowledge of AHLC services among some faculty as well as students. For the most part there is concordance between faculty and students who make use of AHLC student services as to form and direction of expansion.

The questionnaire item pertaining to AHLC Faculty Workshop Improvement generated a number of suggestions. These included:

Summer workshops when faculty have more free time

Workshops by outside "experts"

Workshops providing more faculty involvement

Future workshops on:

current job markets

current field information

test construction

non-medical healing

health insurance

mental health

alcoholism

modules for student use

modules for faculty use

AHLC facilities

The few negative comments about Faculty Workshops included "insufficient notice" and "uninteresting."

The questionnaire item referencing AHLC Instructional Aid production drew almost no response. Several "very satisfactory" and similar comments appeared along with one suggesting "shorter production time" and one suggesting "more help." Those faculty using this AHLC service are generally content with its operation.

When responding to the question pertaining to the future role of AHLC most faculty believe AHLC should serve functions of remediation and tutorially

meet specific learning needs of students. Many faculty additionally believe AHLC should serve as an academic information center or resource center for faculty. One faculty member neatly summed up the suggestions (and provided a future motto) with "help students and help faculty help students."

There are, and may always be, those faculty and students who do not want, nor believe they need, any help teaching or learning. With diligence and patience many of these individuals may be made aware of the benefits of AHLC services and some of them may eventually come to use the services. Most of the faculty and students are aware of AHLC services, use at least some of them, and believe they are helpful, beneficial, and should be expanded.

Table 1

Faculty Respondents
by Department

Department	Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Number of Respondents	12	12	6	19	31	7	5	92
Percent of Total	13.0%	13.0%	6.5%	20.7%	33.7%	7.6%	5.4%	100.0%

Table 2

**Faculty Response
by Position**

Position:	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
Full time faculty	86	93.5%
Part time faculty	4	4.3%
Department chairmen	2	2.2%

Table 3

Faculty Response
by Rank

Rank:	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
Professor	15	16.3%
Associate Professor	16	17.4%
Assistant Professor	32	34.8%
Lecturer	15	16.3%
Instructor	14	15.2%

Table 4

**Faculty Response
by Tenure**

Tenure:	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
Tenured	46	50.0%
Non-tenured	46	50.0%

Table 5

Faculty Position
by Department

Position:		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology
Full time faculty	Number of respondents	12	11	6	18	31	4	4
	% of dept.*	100.0%	91.7%	100.0%	94.7%	100.0%	57.1%	80.0%
	% of total**	13.0%	12.0%	6.5%	19.6%	33.7%	4.3%	4.3%
Part time faculty	Number of respondents	0	1	0	0	0	2	1
	% of dept.*	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	28.6%	20.0%
	% of total**	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	1.1%
Dept. chairman	Number of respondents	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
	% of dept.*	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%
	% of total**	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%

*Throughout this report "Percentage of department" is defined as percentage of a department's total response.

**Throughout this report "Percentage of total" is defined as percentage of total response.

Table 6

Faculty Rank
by Department

Ranks:		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology
Professor	Number of respondents	5	3	1	2	3	1	0
	% of dept.	41.7%	25.0%	16.7%	10.5%	9.7%	14.3%	0.0%
	% of total	5.4%	3.3%	1.1%	2.2%	3.3%	1.1%	0.0%
Associate Professor	Number of respondents	3	4	2	2	3	1	1
	% of dept.	25.0%	33.0%	33.3%	10.5%	9.7%	14.3%	20.0%
	% of total	3.3%	4.3%	2.2%	2.2%	3.3%	1.1%	1.1%
Assistant Professor	Number of respondents	4	2	1	7	14	2	2
	% of dept.	33.3%	16.7%	16.7%	36.8%	45.2%	28.6%	40.0%
	% of total	4.3%	2.2%	1.1%	7.6%	15.2%	2.2%	2.2%
Lecturer	Number of respondents	0	1		2	8	2	2
	% of dept.	0.0%	8.3%		10.5%	25.8%	28.6%	40.0%
	% of total	0.0%	1.1%		2.2%	8.7%	2.2%	2.2%
Instructor	Number of respondents	0	2	2	6	3	1	0
	% of dept.	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	31.6%	9.7%	14.3%	0.0%
	% of total	0.0%	2.2%	2.2%	6.5%	3.3%	1.1%	0.0%

Table 7

Faculty Tenure
by Department

Tenure:		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology
Tenured	Number of respondents	12	7	3	7	13	3	1
	% of dept.	100.0%	58.3%	50.0%	36.8%	41.9%	42.9%	20.0%
	% of total	13.0%	7.6%	3.3%	7.6%	14.1%	3.3%	1.1%
Non- tenured	Number of respondents	0	5	3	12	18	4	4
	% of dept.	0.0%	41.7%	50.0%	63.2%	58.1%	57.1%	80.0%
	% of total	0.0%	5.4%	3.3%	13.0%	19.6%	4.3%	4.3%

Table 8

Faculty Length of
Service at N.Y.C.C.C.
by Department

		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology
1 year	Number of respondents	0	1	1	4	0	0	2
	% of dept.	0.0%	8.3%	16.7%	21.1%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%
	% of total	0.0%	1.1%	1.1%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%
2 years	Number of respondents	0	0	0	5	1	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	26.3%	3.2%	0.0%	20.0%
	% of total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.4%	1.1%	0.0%	1.1%
3-5 years	Number of respondents	0	2	1	3	13	2	1
	% of dept.	0.0%	16.7%	16.7%	15.8%	41.9%	28.6%	20.0%
	% of total	0.0%	2.2%	1.1%	3.3%	14.1%	2.2%	1.1%
6-10 years	Number of respondents	5	5	1	5	11	5	1
	% of dept.	41.7%	41.7%	16.7%	26.3%	35.5%	71.4%	20.0%
	% of total	5.4%	5.4%	1.1%	5.4%	12.0%	5.4%	1.1%
11-30 years	Number of respondents	7	4	3	2	6	0	0
	% of dept.	58.3%	33.3%	50.0%	10.5%	19.4%	0.0%	0.0%
	% of total	7.6%	4.3%	3.3%	2.2%	6.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Mean		15.9	12.5	15.3	5.6	7.0	7.0	3.2
						All respondents - 8.92		
Standard Deviation		8.04	9.76	12.97	5.67	3.59	2.71	2.95
						All respondents - 7.52		

Table 9

Faculty Prior Teaching
Experience by Department

		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology
None	Number of respondents	1	5	2	5	7	6	1
	% of dept.	8.3%	41.7%	33.3%	26.3%	22.6%	85.7%	20.0%
	% of total	1.1%	5.4%	2.2%	5.4%	7.6%	6.5%	1.1%
1 year	Number of respondents	2	0	0	3	1	0	1
	% of dept.	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	15.8%	3.2%	0.0%	20.0%
	% of total	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	1.1%	0.0%	1.1%
2 years	Number of respondents	2	3	1	2	2	0	0
	% of dept.	16.7%	25.0%	16.7%	10.5%	6.5%	0.0%	0.0%
	% of total	2.2%	3.3%	1.1%	2.2%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%
3-5 years	Number of respondents	2	3	3	0	8	1	1
	% of dept.	16.7%	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	25.8%	14.3%	20.0%
	% of total	2.2%	3.3%	3.3%	0.0%	8.7%	1.1%	1.1%
6-10 years	Number of respondents	4	1	0	3	9	0	1
	% of dept.	33.3%	8.3%	0.0%	15.8%	29.0%	0.0%	20.0%
	% of total	4.3%	1.1%	0.0%	3.3%	9.8%	0.0%	1.1%
11-30 years	Number of respondents	1	0	0	6	4	0	1
	% of dept.	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	31.6%	13.0%	0.0%	20.0%
	% of total	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	6.5%	4.3%	0.0%	1.1%
Mean		4.6	2.2	2.3	7.4	5.3	0.6	7.0
Standard Deviation		3.63	2.91	2.07	10.01	5.10	1.51	8.25
						All respondents - 4.47		
						All respondents - 6.23		

Table 10

Student Respondents
by Department

Department	Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Radiologic Technology	Ophthalmic Dispensing
Number of Respondents	3	71	17	175	130	47	46
Percent of Total	0.6%	21.5%	3.5%	35.8%	26.6%	9.6%	9.1%

Table 11

Student Attendance
Category by Department

Attendance Category:	Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Radiologic Technology	Ophthalmic Dispensing
Full time, Number of respondents	3	69	16	115	111	44	25
% of dept.	100.0%	97.2%	44.1%	65.7%	85.4%	93.6%	54.3%
% of total	0.6%	14.2%	3.3%	23.6%	22.8%	9.0%	5.1%
Part time, Number of respondents	0	1	1	4	5	2	0
% of dept.	0.0%	1.4%	5.9%	2.3%	3.8%	1.5%	0.0%
% of total	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.8%	1.0%	0.4%	0.0%
Full time, Number of respondents	0	0	0	28	3	0	4
% of dept.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.0%	2.3%	0.0%	8.7%
% of total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.7%	.6%	0.0%	0.8%
Part time, Number of respondents	0	1	0	28	10	0	17
% of dept.	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	16.0%	7.7%	0.0%	37.0%
% of total	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	5.7%	2.1%	0.0%	3.5%

Table 12

Student Enrollment
Pattern by Department

Enrollment Pattern:	Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Radiologic Technology	Optometric Dispensing
Continuous	3 100.0% 0.6%	67 94.4% 14.4%	16 94.1% 3.4%	162 92.6% 34.8%	116 89.2% 24.9%	44 93.6% 9.5%	44 95.7% 9.5%
Non-continuous	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	1 5.9% 0.2%	6 3.4% 1.3%	4 3.1% 0.9%	0 0.0% 0.0%	2 4.3% 0.4%

Table 13
Student Expected Graduation
Year by Department

Expected Graduation Year:	Chemical Technology		Dental Hygiene		Dental Medical Lab		Nursing		Radiologic Technology		Ophthalmic Dispensing	
	Number of residents % of dept. % of total											
1975	1 33.3% 0.2%	1 1.4% 0.2%	2 11.8% 0.4%	45 25.7% 9.5%	1 0.8% 0.2%	0 0.0% 0.0%	2 4.4% 0.4%					
1976	1 33.3% 0.2%	55 77.5% 11.6%	8 47.1% 1.7%	86 49.1% 18.1%	64 49.2% 13.5%	12 25.5% 2.5%	24 52.2% 5.1%					
1977	0 0.0% 0.0%	15 21.1% 3.2%	7 41.2% 1.5%	26 5.9% 5.5%	51 39.2% 10.7%	29 61.7% 6.1%	14 30.4% 2.9%					
1978	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	3 1.7% 0.6%	4 3.1% 0.8%	6 12.8% 1.3%	6 13.0% 1.3%					
Other*	1 33.3% 0.2%	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	8 4.6% 1.7%	3 2.3% 0.6%	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%					

* Respondents designating "Other" specify 1979 as their expected year of graduation or indicate they will transfer out of N.Y.C.C.C. prior to graduation.



Table 14

Student Starting Year
by Department

Starting Year:	Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Radiologic Technology	Ophthalmic Dispensing	
1971	Number of respondents % of dept. % of total	0 0.0% 0.0%	1 1.4% 0.3%	0 0.0% 0.0%	6 3.4% 1.2%	6 4.6% 1.2%	0 0.0% 0.0%	1 2.2% 0.2%
1972	Number of respondents % of dept. % of total	0 0.0% 0.0%	1 1.4% 0.2%	1 5.9% 0.2%	36 20.1% 7.4%	29 22.3% 6.0%	3 6.4% 0.6%	1 2.2% 0.2%
1973	Number of respondents % of dept. % of total	1 33.3% 0.2%	1 1.4% 0.2%	3 17.6% 0.6%	70 40.0% 11.4%	34 26.2% 7.0%	5 10.6% 1.0%	4 8.7% 0.8%
1974	Number of respondents % of dept. % of total	1 33.3% 0.2%	66 93.0% 13.6%	6 41.2% 1.2%	42 5.1% 8.6%	55 42.3% 11.3%	36 76.4% 7.4%	19 41.3% 3.9%
1975	Number of respondents % of dept. % of total	1 33.3% 0.2%	2 2.8% 0.4%	7 41.2% 1.4%	9 5.1% 1.9%	3 2.3% 0.6%	3 6.4% 0.6%	21 45.6% 4.3%
Other*	Number of respondents % of dept. % of total	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	9 5.1% 1.9%	3 2.3% 0.6%	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%

* Respondents designating "Other" as their starting year specify 1968, 1969, and 1970.

Table 15

Student Age
by Department

Age:	Chemical Technology				Dental Hygiene		Dental Lab		Medical Lab		Nursing	Radiologic Technology	Ophthalmic Dispensing		
	Number of respondents	% of dept.	% of total												
Less than 10	1	33.3%	0.2%	35	49.3%	7.3%	1	5.9%	12	6.9%	14	29.8%	1	2.2%	0.2%
19-20	0	0.0%	0.0%	24	33.8%	5.0%	7	41.2%	59	33.7%	24	18.5%	16	34.8%	3.3%
21-23	1	33.3%	0.2%	7	9.9%	1.0%	5	29.4%	30	17.1%	11	8.5%	13	28.3%	2.7%
24-26	0	0.0%	0.0%	3	4.2%	0.6%	1	5.9%	27	15.4%	13	10.0%	6	13.0%	1.2%
27-29	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	2	11.8%	15	8.6%	12	9.2%	6	13.0%	1.2%
30-35	1	33.3%	0.2%	1	1.4%	0.2%	1	5.9%	21	12.0%	22	16.9%	2	4.3%	0.4%
36-40	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	1.1%	20	15.4%	1	2.2%	0.2%
Over 40	0	0.0%	0.0%	1	1.4%	0.2%	0	0.0%	6	3.4%	10	7.7%	1	2.2%	0.2%

Table 16

Student Credits Transferred
In by Department

Credits:		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Radiologic Technology	Ophthalmic Dispensing
0	Number of respondents	3	60	9	143	114	39	40
	% of dept.	100.0%	84.5%	52.9	81.7	87.7	83.0	83.3
1	Number of respondents	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%
	% of total	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
2	Number of respondents	0	0	3	6	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0%	0.0%	17.6%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	% of total	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	Number of respondents	0	1	0	2	5	3	0
	% of dept.	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	1.1%	3.8%	6.4%	0.0%
	% of total	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.1%	1.0%	0.6%	0.0%
4	Number of respondents	0	4	1	7	3	2	0
	% of dept.	0.0%	5.6%	5.9%	4.0%	2.3%	4.3%	0.0%
	% of total	0.0%	0. %	0.2%	1.1%	0.6%	0.4%	0.0%
5	Number of respondents	0	0	1	7	2	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	4.0%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%
	% of total	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	1.1%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%
6	Number of respondents	0	1	0	5	4	1	0
	% of dept.	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	2.9%	3.1%	2.1%	0.0%
	% of total	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	1.0%	0.8%	0.2%	0.0%
7	Number of respondents	0	2	1	3	1	1	0
	% of dept.	0.0%	2.8%	5.9%	1.7%	0.8%	2.1%	0.0%
	% of total	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.6%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%
8	Number of respondents	0	2	0	2	0	0	0
	% of dept.	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	% of total	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9 or more	Number of respondents	0	1	1	0	0	1	6
	% of dept.	0.0%	1.4%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	16.7%
	% of total	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	1.2%
Mean Credits Trans- ferred by Department		0.0	0.9	1.9	0.8	0.5	0.9	1.2
Mean Credits Transferred of Those Students Trans- ferring Credits		0.0	5.8	4.1	4.6	4.3	5.0	9.0

*Percentage of total

Table 17

Students' Prior Experience
in the Health Field by
Department

Prior Experience:	Chemical			Dental			Dental Medical			Radiologic			Ophthalmic	
	Technology	Hygiene	Lab	Lab	Lab	Lab	Nursing	Technology	Technology	Technology	Dispensing	Dispensing		
None	Number of respondents	62	15	147	70	39	43							
	% of dept.	87.3%	88.2%	84.0%	53.8%	82.9%	93.5%							
	% of total	12.7%	3.1%	30.0%	14.3%	7.9%	8.8%							
Aide	Number of respondents	7	0	11	19	2	1							
	% of dept.	9.9%	0.0%	6.3%	14.6%	4.3%	2.2%							
	% of total	1.4%	0.0%	2.3%	3.9%	0.4%	0.2%							
LPN	Number of respondents	1	0	2	37	2	0							
	% of dept.	33.3%	0.0%	1.1%	28.5%	4.3%	0.0%							
	% of total	0.2%	0.0%	0.4%	7.6%	0.4%	0.0%							
Technician	Number of respondents	0	2	12	3	2	2							
	% of dept.	0.0%	11.8%	6.9%	2.3%	4.3%	3.4%							
	% of total	0.0%	0.4%	2.5%	0.6%	0.4%	0.4%							
Corpsman (military)	Number of respondents	0	0	2	0	1	0							
	% of dept.	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%							
	% of total	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%							
Orderly	Number of respondents	0	0	1	1	1	0							
	% of dept.	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.8%	2.1%	0.0%							
	% of total	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%							

Table 18

Student Salaried Employment
by Department

Hours Employed:	Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Radiologic Technology	Ophthalmic Dispensing	
None	Number of respondents % of dept. % of total	2 66.7% 0.4%	39 54.9% 7.9%	9 52.9% 1.8%	78 44.6% 16.0	53 40.8% 10.8%	27 57.4% 5.5%	14 30.4% 2.9%
1-10	Number of respondents % of dept. % of total	0 0.0% 0.0%	15 21.1% 3.1%	2 11.8% 0.4%	11 6.3% 2.2%	3 2.3% 0.6%	4 8.5% 0.8%	5 10.9% 1.0%
11-20	Number of respondents % of dept. % of total	1 33.3% 0.2%	14 19.4% 2.9%	3 17.6% 0.6%	24 13.7% 4.9%	23 17.7% 4.8%	10 21.3% 2.0%	7 15.2% 1.5%
21-30	Number of respondents % of dept. % of total	0 0.0% 0.0%	2 2.8% 0.4%	2 11.8% 0.4%	11 6.3% 2.2%	13 10.0% 2.7%	4 8.5% 0.8%	6 13.0% 1.2%
31-40	Number of respondents % of dept. % of total	0 0.0% 0.0%	1 1.4% 0.2%	1 5.9% 0.2%	44 25.1% 9.1%	34 26.2% 7.0%	1 2.1% 0.2%	10 21.7% 2.1%
Over 40	Number of respondents % of dept. % of total	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	0 0.0% 0.0%	7 4.0% 1.5%	4 3.1% 0.8%	1 2.1% 0.2%	4 8.7% 0.8%
Mean hours employed:	5.0	5.2	8.2	14.5	15.8	7.4	17.1	

Table 19

Faculty Use of AHLC
Services by Department

Services:		Chem. Tech.	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radio. Tech.	Total
Instruct- ional Aids	Number of respondents	3	6	0	12	15	6	4	46
	% of dept.	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	63.2%	48.4%	85.7%	80.0%	50.0%*
Student Services	Number of respondents	11	10	3	17	30	6	3	80
	% of dept.	91.6%	83.3%	50.0%	89.5%	96.8%	85.7%	60.0%	86.9%*
Student Records	Number of respondents	5	5	2	6	12	4	2	36
	% of dept.	41.7%	41.7%	33.3%	31.6%	38.7%	57.1%	40.0%	39.1%*
A/V Equip- ment	Number of respondents	5	9	1	14	24	5	3	61
	% of dept.	41.7%	75.0%	16.7%	73.7%	77.4%	71.4%	60.0%	66.3%*
Faculty Workshops	Number of respondents	7	9	1	14	23	5	2	61
	% of dept.	58.3%	75.0%	16.7%	73.7%	74.2%	71.4%	40.0%	66.3%*

* Percent of total

Table 20

Faculty Use of AHLC
Services by Rank

Services:		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Instructor
Instructional Aids	Number of respondents	7	8	19	7	5
	% of dept.	46.7%	50.0%	59.4%	46.7%	35.7%
Student Services	Number of respondents	15	14	27	13	11
	% of dept.	100.0%	87.5%	84.4%	86.7%	78.6%
Student Records	Number of respondents	9	5	14	5	3
	% of dept.	60.0%	31.3%	43.8%	33.3%	21.4%
A/V Equipment	Number of respondents	10	11	24	9	7
	% of dept.	66.7%	68.8%	75.0%	60.0%	50.0%
Faculty Workshops	Number of respondents	12	11	22	8	8
	% of dept.	80.0%	68.8%	68.8%	53.3%	57.1%
Mean Percent Use		70.68	61.28	66.28	56.0%	48.56

Table 21

**Faculty Use of AHLC
Services by Tenure**

Services:		Tenured	Non-tenured
Instruct- ional Aids	Number of respondents % of dept.	24 52.1%	21 45.7%
Student Services	Number of respondents % of dept.	41 89.1%	38 82.6%
Student Records	Number of respondents % of dept.	21 45.7%	15 32.6%
A/V Equip- ment	Number of respondents % of dept.	32 69.6%	28 60.9%
Faculty Workshops	Number of respondents % of dept.	32 69.6%	29 63.0%
Mean Percent Use		65.22	56.96

Table 22

Faculty Use of AHLC
 Services by Length of Service

Services:		1 year	2 years	3-5 years	6-10 years	11-30 years
Instructional Aids	Number of respondents	4	3	9	21	9
	% of dept.	50.0%	42.9%	40.9%	63.6%	40.9%
Student Services	Number of respondents	7	6	18	29	20
	% of dept.	87.5%	85.7%	81.8%	87.9%	90.9%
Student Records	Number of respondents	0	3	7	16	10
	% of dept.	0.0%	42.9%	31.8%	48.5%	45.5%
A/V Equipment	Number of respondents	4	6	12	26	13
	% of dept.	50.0%	85.7%	54.5%	78.8%	59.1%
Faculty Workshops	Number of respondents	2	4	16	23	16
	% of dept.	25.0%	57.1%	72.7%	69.7%	72.7%
Mean Percent Use		42.65	62.86	56.32	69.7	61.82

Table 23

Faculty Recommendation of AHLC
Services to Students with Academic
Problems by Department

	Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology
Number of respondents	9	11	2	17	30	6	4
% by dept.	75.0%	91.7%	33.3%	89.5%	96.9%	85.7%	80.0%

Table 24

Faculty Recommendation of AHLC
 Services to Students with Academic
 Problems by Tenure

	Tenured	Non-tenured
Number of respondents	39	39
% of Tenure Condition	84.8%	84.8%

Table 25

**Faculty Recommendation of AHLC
Services to Students with Academic
Problems by Rank**

	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Instructor
Number of respondents	13	12	29	14	11
% of rank	86.7%	75.0%	90.6%	93.3%	78.6%

Table 26

Faculty Recommendation of AHLC
Services to Students with Academic
Problems by Length of Service

	1 year	2 years	3-5 years	6-10 years	11-30 years
Number of respondents	7	6	20	29	17
% of category	87.5%	85.7%	90.9%	87.9%	100.0%

Table 27

Faculty Use of Modular
Instruction Development
by Department

Modular Instructions:		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology
For class- room use	Number of respondents % of dept.	1 8.3%	2 16.7%	0 0.0%	3 15.8%	20 64.5%	3 42.9%	1 20.0%
For inde- pendent study use	Number of respondents % of dept.	1 8.3%	3 25.0%	1 16.7%	3 15.8%	17 54.8%	4 57.1%	1 20.0%

Table 28

Faculty Use of Modular
Instruction Development
by Tenure

		Tenured	Non-tenured
For class- room use	Number of respondents % of category	14 30.4%	16 34.8%
For inde- pendent study use	Number of respondents % of category	17 36.9%	13 28.3%

Table 29

Faculty Use of Modular
Instruction Development
by Rank

		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Instructor
For class- room use	Number of respondents	2	5	16	6	2
	% of categ.	13.3%	31.3%	50.0%	40.0%	14.3%
For inde- pendent study use	Number of respondents	4	8	12	5	1
	% of categ.	26.7%	53.3%	37.5%	33.3%	7.1%

Table 30

**Faculty Use of Modular
Instruction Development
by Length of Service**

		1 year	2 years	3-5 years	6-10 years	11-30 years
For class- room use	Number of respondents	1	0	9	16	4
	% of categ.	12.5%	0.0%	40.1%	48.5%	18.9%
For inde- pendent study use	Number of respondents	0	1	7	16	6
	% of categ.	0.0%	14.3%	31.8%	48.5%	27.3%

Table 31

Professional Contact Between
Faculty and AHLC Personnel per
Semester by Department

Number of Contacts:		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology
None	Number of respondents % of dept.	5 41.7%	5 41.7%	3 50.0%	4 21.1%	4 12.9%	2 28.6%	2 40.0%
1-2 con- tacts/sem.	Number of respondents % of dept.	4 33.3%	1 8.3%	2 33.3%	8 42.1%	18 58.1%	1 14.3%	2 40.0%
3-5 con- tacts/sem.	Number of respondents % of dept.	3 25.0%	3 25.0%	0 0.0%	2 10.5%	1 3.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
6-8 con- tacts/sem.	Number of respondents % of dept.	0 0.0%	3 25.0%	0 0.0%	3 15.8%	2 6.5%	2 28.6%	0 0.0%
9-11 con- tacts/sem.	Number of respondents % of dept.	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.3%	2 6.5%	1 14.3%	0 0.0%
12 or more contacts/ sem.	Number of respondents % of dept.	2 16.7%	2 16.7%	1 33.3%	3 15.8%	4 12.9%	2 28.6%	1 20.0%
Mean number of contacts per faculty member		3.5	4.9	2.5	4.6	3.5	7.1	3.0

Table 32

**Professional Contact Between
Faculty and AHLC Personnel per
Semester by Tenure**

		Tenured	Non-tenured
0	Number of respondents % of categ.	7 15.2%	11 23.9%
1-2	Number of respondents % of categ.	11 23.9%	25 54.3%
3-5	Number of respondents % of categ.	6 13.0%	3 6.5%
6-8	Number of respondents % of categ.	7 15.2%	3 6.5%
9-11	Number of respondents % of categ.	3 6.5%	1 2.2%
Over 12	Number of respondents % of categ.	12 26.1%	3 6.5%
Mean Number of Contacts by Tenure		5.7	2.5

Table 33

Professional Contact Between
Faculty and AHLC Personnel per
Semester by Rank

		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Instructor
None	Number of respondents	4	2	5	2	5
	% of categ.	26.7%	12.5%	15.6%	13.3%	35.7%
1-2	Number of respondents	1	4	14	11	6
	% of categ.	6.7%	25.0%	43.8%	7.3%	42.9%
3-5	Number of respondents	1	3	3	1	1
	% of categ.	6.7%	18.8%	9.4%	6.7%	7.1%
6-8	Number of respondents	3	3	3	0	1
	% of categ.	20.0%	18.8%	9.4%	0.0%	7.1%
9-11	Number of respondents	0	1	3	0	0
	% of categ.	0.0%	6.3%	9.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Over 12	Number of respondents	6	3	4	1	1
	% of categ.	40.0%	18.8%	12.5%	6.7%	7.1%
Mean Number of Contacts per Faculty Member		6.6	5.3	4.1	2.2	2.3

Table 34

Professional Contact Between
Faculty and AHLC Personnel per
Semester by Length of Service

		1 year	2 years	3-5 years	6-10 years	11-30 years
None	Number of respondents	5	0	3	4	6
	% of categ.	62.5%	0.0%	13.6%	12.1%	9.1%
1-2	Number of respondents	1	6	15	10	4
	% of categ.	12.5%	85.7%	68.2%	30.3%	18.2%
3-5	Number of respondents	1	0	1	4	3
	% of categ.	12.5%	0.0%	4.5%	12.1%	13.6%
6-8	Number of respondents	1	0	1	6	2
	% of categ.	12.5%	0.0%	4.5%	18.2%	9.1%
9-11	Number of respondents	0	0	1	3	0
	% of categ.	0.0%	0.0%	4.5%	9.1%	0.0%
Over 12	Number of respondents	0	1	1	0	7
	% of categ.	0.0%	14.3%	4.5%	0.0%	31.8%
Mean Number of Contacts by Length of Service		1.6	3.0	2.5	3.2	5.3

Table 35

Faculty Awareness of AHLC
Services by Department

Awareness:		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radiologic Technology
No know- ledge	Number of respondents	2	1	3	0	2	1	1
	% of dept.	16.7%	8.3%	50.0%	0.0%	6.5%	14.3%	20.0%
Little knowledge	Number of respondents	1	0	2	1	3	0	1
	% of dept.	8.3%		33.3%	5.3%	9.7%	0.0%	20.0%
Moderate knowledge	Number of respondents	8	4	1	12	19	3	2
	% of dept.	66.7%	33.3%	16.7%	63.2%	61.3%	42.9%	40.0%
Complete knowledge	Number of respondents	1	7	0	6	7	3	1
	% of dept.	8.3%	58.3%	0.0%	31.6	22.6%	42.9%	20.0%

Table 36

Faculty Awareness of AHLC
Services by Tenure

		Tenured	Non-tenured
No know- ledge	Number of respondents % of tenured	5 10.9%	6 13.0%
Little knowledge	Number of respondents % of tenured	2 4.3%	6 13.0%
Moderate knowledge	Number of respondents % of tenured	21 45.7%	27 58.7%
Complete knowledge	Number of respondents % of tenured	18 39.1%	7 15.2%

Table 37

**Faculty Awareness of AHLC
Services by Rank**

		Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturer	Instructor
No know- ledge	Number of respondents	3	1	3	1	2
	% of rank	20.0%	6.3%	9.8%	6.7%	14.3%
Little knowledge	Number of respondents	1	0	2	2	3
	% of rank	6.7%	0.0%	6.3%	13.3%	21.4%
Moderate knowledge	Number of respondents	4	8	18	12	7
	% of rank	26.7%	50.0%	56.3%	80.0%	50.0%
Complete knowledge	Number of respondents	7	7	9	0	2
	% of rank	46.7%	43.7%	28.1%	0.0%	14.3%

Table 38

Faculty Awareness of AHLC
Services by Length of Service

		1 year	2 years	3-5 years	6-10 years	11-30 years
No know- ledge	Number of respondents	1	0	2	3	4
	% of category	12.5%	0.0%	9.1%	9.1%	18.2%
Little knowledge	Number of respondents	1	2	2	2	1
	% of category	12.5%	28.6%	9.1%	6.1%	4.5%
Moderate knowledge	Number of respondents	5	5	14	15	10
	% of category	62.5%	71.4%	77.8%	45.5%	45.5%
Complete knowledge	Number of respondents	1	0	4	13	7
	% of category	12.5%	0.0%	18.2%	39.4%	31.8%

Table 39

Explanation of AHLC Services
From Instructors by Department

		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Yes	Number of respondents	2	60	1	104	97	30	294
	% of dept.	65.7%	84.5%	5.9%	59.4%	74.6%	63.8%	66.4%
No	Number of respondents	1	11	16	71	33	17	149
	% of dept.	33.3%	15.5%	94.1%	40.6%	25.4%	36.2%	33.6%

Table 40

Recommendation of AHLC Services
From Instructors by Department

		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Yes	Number of respondents	1	63	2	101	86	30	283
	% of dept.	33.3%	88.7%	11.8	57.7%	66.2%	63.8%	63.9%
No	Number of respondents	2	8	15	74	44	17	160
	% of dept.	66.7%	11.3%	88.2%	42.3%	33.8%	36.2%	36.1%

Table 41

Explanation of AHLC Services
From Student Personnel Services
Counselors by Department

		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Yes	Number of respondents	1	32	1	45	38	17	134
	% of dept.	33.3%	45.1%	5.9%	25.7%	29.2%	36.2%	30.2%
No	Number of respondents	2	39	16	130	92	30	309
	% of dept.	66.7%	54.9%	94.1%	74.3%	70.8%	63.8%	69.8%

Table 42

**Recommendation of AHLC Services
From Student Personnel Services
Counselors by Department**

		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Technology	Total
Yes	Number of respondents	1	28	0	41	38	15	123
	% of dept.	33.3%	39.4%	0.0%	23.4%	29.2%	31.9%	27.8%
No	Number of respondents	2	43	17	134	92	32	320
	% of dept.	66.7%	60.6%	100.0%	76.6%	70.8%	68.1%	72.2%

Table 43

Explanation of AHLC Services
From Departmental Academic
Advisors by Department

		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Yes	Number of respondents	2	51	0	54	58	17	182
	% of dept.	66.7%	71.8%	0.0%	30.9%	44.6%	31.9%	41.1%
No	Number of respondents	1	20	17	121	72	30	261
	% of dept.	33.3%	28.2%	100.0%	69.1%	65.4%	68.1%	58.9%

Table 44

Recommendation of AHLC Services
From Departmental Academic
Advisors by Department

		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Yes	Number of respondents	1	47	0	47	57	17	169
	% of dept.	33.3%	66.2%	0.0%	26.9%	43.8%	31.9%	38.1%
No	Number of respondents	2	24	17	128	73	30	274
	% of dept.	66.7%	43.8%	100.0%	73.1%	56.2%	68.1%	61.9%

Table 45

Students Attending Freshman
Learning Skills Laboratory
by Department

		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Yes	Number of respondents	1	48	0	9	49	6	113
	% of dept.	33.3%	67.6%	0.0%	5.1%	37.7%	12.8%	25.5%
No	Number of respondents	2	23	17	166	81	41	330
	% of dept.	66.7%	32.4%	100.0%	94.9%	62.3%	87.2%	74.5%

Table 46

Students Attending Effective
Reading Program by Department

		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Yes	Number of respondents	0	67	0	13	62	6	148
	% of dept.	0.0%	94.4%	0.0%	7.4%	47.7%	12.8%	33.4%
No	Number of respondents	3	4	17	162	68	41	295
	% of dept.	100.0%	5.6%	100.0%	92.6%	52.3%	87.2%	66.6%

Table 47

Students' Attendance of Effective
Reading Program Sessions by Department

	Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Radiologic Technology	Total
1	0	5	0	1	3	0	9
2	0	3	0	1	7	0	11
3	0	0	0	1	4	0	5
4	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
5	0	2	0	0	4	1	8
6	0	5	0	1	7	0	13
7	0	40	0	1	8	0	50
8	0	1	0	1	3	0	7
9	0	2	0	0	3	0	5

Table 48

Students Attending Open Lab
Program by Department

		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Yes	Number of respondents	2	27	1	31	39	11	111
	% of dept.	66.7%	38.0%	5.9%	17.7%	30.0%	23.4%	25.1%
No	Number of respondents	1	44	16	144	91	36	332
	% of dept.	33.3%	62.0%	94.1%	82.3%	70.7%	76.6%	74.9%

Table 49

Students' Use of Open Lab
Facility by Department

Assistance Obtained:		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Peer Assis- tance	Number of respondents % of dept.	2 66.7%	4 5.6%	0 0.0%	20 11.4%	17 13.1%	4 8.5%	47 10.6%
Graduate/ Faculty Assistance	Number of respondents % of dept.	1 33.3%	9 12.7%	0 0.0%	7 4.0%	11 8.5%	3 6.4%	31 7.0%
Individual Study Modules	Number of respondents % of dept.	2 66.7%	19 26.7%	1 5.9%	17 9.7%	34 26.2%	8 17.0%	81 18.3%
Study Guides	Number of respondents % of dept.	0 0.0%	8 11.3%	0 0.0%	9 5.1%	19 14.6%	1 2.2%	37 8.4%
Study Materials	Number of respondents % of dept.	0 0.0%	15 21.1%	0 0.0%	12 6.9%	22 16.9%	4 8.5%	53 12.0%

Table 50

Students Attending Certification
Seminars by Department

		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Yes	Number of respondents	0	2	1	5	2	0	10
	% of dept.	0.0%	2.8%	5.9%	2.9%	1.5%	0.0%	2.3%
No	Number of respondents	3	69	16	170	128	47	433
	% of dept.	100.0%	97.2%	94.1%	97.1%	98.5%	100.0%	97.7%

Table 51

Results of 2x2 Chi Square Procedures
On Source of Information vs. Use of
AHLC Services

Condition	Source	Service	N	Chi Square	P
1	Instructor Explained	Attended Fresh. Skills Lab	452	29.188	0.0000
2	"	" Effective Reading Prgm.	446	39.661	0.0000
3	"	" Open Lab	433	9.912	0.0016
4	"	" Certification Seminar	299	0.694	0.4045
5	Instructor Recommended	" Fresh. Skills Lab	454	45.568	0.0000
6	"	" Effective Reading Prgm.	445	57.144	0.0000
7	"	" Open Lab	434	8.349	0.0039
8	"	" Certification Seminar	299	0.155	0.6937
9	S.P.S. Counselors Explained	" Fresh. Skills Lab	447	23.650	0.0000
10	"	" Effective Reading Prgm.	435	20.497	0.0000
11	"	" Open Lab	425	8.473	0.0036
12	"	" Certification Seminar	290	0.106	0.7445
13	S.P.S. Counselors Recommended	" Fresh. Skills Lab	446	13.061	0.0003
14	"	" Effective Reading Prgm.	434	20.114	0.0000
15	"	" Open Lab	422	8.061	0.0045
16	"	" Certification Seminar	290	0.001	0.9707
17	Dept. Acad. Advisors Explained	" Fresh. Skills Lab	455	43.943	0.0000
18	"	" Effective Reading Prgm.	446	60.252	0.0000
19	"	" Open Lab	434	12.293	0.0005
20	"	" Certification Seminar	299	0.431	0.5115
21	Dept. Acad. Advisors Recommended	" Fresh. Skills Lab	449	40.288	0.0000
22	"	" Effective Reading Prgm.	438	54.963	0.0000
23	"	" Open Lab	430	13.012	0.0003
24	"	" Certification Seminar	295	0.091	0.7629

Table 52

Perceived Effectiveness in
Instructional Aid Preparation

Effectiveness		Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
Was assistance in development of materials provided	Number of respondents % of fac.	33 68.8%	9 18.8%	5 10.4%	1 2.1%
Were materials correctly produced	Number of respondents % of fac.	28 62.2%	12 26.7%	5 11.1%	0 0.0%
Were materials produced effective	Number of respondents % of fac.	29 65.9%	11 25.0%	4 9.1%	0 0.0%
Did materials arrive on time	Number of respondents % of fac.	25 59.5%	10 23.8%	7 16.6%	0 0.0%
Was reproduction and distribution of materials satisfactory	Number of respondents % of fac.	28 68.3%	7 17.1%	6 15.6%	0 0.0%
Was "red tape" excessive	Number of respondents % of fac.	1 2.7%	1 2.7%	7 18.9%	28 75.7%

Table 53

Perceived Benefit of
Instructional Aid Preparation

Benefit		Yes	Sometimes	No
Allowed use of materials not otherwise available	Number of respondents	21	15	13
	% of fac.	42.9%	30.6%	26.5%
Students learning was increased by these materials	Number of respondents	34	9	4
	% of fac.	72.3%	19.1%	8.5%

Table 54

Perceived Effectiveness of
 AHLC Student Services

Effectiveness:

Certification Seminars		Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
Provide a necessary service	Number of respondents % of fac.	22 45.8%	24 50.0%	2 4.2%	0 0.0%
Increase student knowledge	Number of respondents % of fac.	14	27	9	0 0.0%
Increase certification/licensure test passing probability	Number of respondents % of fac.	15 31.3%	21 43.7%	12 25.0%	0 0.0%
Increase student confidence	Number of respondents % of fac.	16 32.7%	22 44.9%	11 22.4%	0 0.0%
Freshman Learning Skills Program					
Provides a necessary service	Number of respondents % of fac.	25 42.4%	22 37.3%	12 20.3%	0 0.0%
Increases student reading and study skills	Number of respondents % of fac.	16 27.9%	22 37.9%	20 34.5%	1 1.7%
Increases certification/licensure test passing probability	Number of respondents % of fac.	13 25.5%	24 47.1%	14 27.5%	0 0.0%
Effective Reading Program					
Provides a necessary service	Number of respondents % of fac.	27 50.0%	16 29.6%	11 20.4%	1 1.9%
Increases student reading rate and comprehension	Number of respondents % of fac.	18 32.7%	20 36.4%	15 27.3%	2 3.6%
Increases student confidence	Number of respondents % of fac.	16 30.2%	21 39.6%	15 28.3%	1 1.9%

(continued next page)

(Table 54 continued)

Open Learning Lab		Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
Provides a necessary service	Number of respondents	21	27	13	0
	% of fac.	34.4%	44.3%	21.3%	0.0%
Increases student knowledge	Number of respondents	15	26	20	0
	% of fac.	24.6%	42.6%	32.8%	0.0%
Increases student confidence	Number of respondents	17	26	18	1
	% of fac.	27.9%	42.6%	29.5%	1.6%

Table 55

Perceived Effectiveness of AHLC
Student Record Services

Effectiveness:

Student Data and Record
Review Schedules have
been

		Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
Prompt	Number of respondents	16	9	1	0
	% of fac.	61.5%	34.6%	3.8%	0.0%
Helpful	Number of respondents	14	11	1	0
	% of fac.	53.8%	42.3%	3.8%	0.0%
In useable format	Number of respondents	13	11	2	0
	% of fac.	50.0%	42.3%	7.7%	0.0%
In sufficient detail	Number of respondents	12	9	4	1
	% of fac.	46.2%	34.6%	15.4%	3.8%

Table 56

Perceived Effectiveness of
AHLC A/V Equipment Services

Effectiveness:

When requesting A/V Equipment, was it		Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
Available as scheduled	Number of respondents	26	9	2	0
	% of fac.	70.3%	33.3%	7.4%	0.0%
In good condition	Number of respondents	26	11	1	0
	% of fac.	68.4%	28.9%	2.6%	0.0%

Table 57

Perceived Benefits of AHLC
A/V Equipment Services

Benefits:		Yes	Sometimes	No
Allowed use of more A/V equipment than otherwise possible	Number of respondents	22	11	7
	% of fac.	55.0%	27.5%	17.5%
Students' learning was increased by use of equipment	Number of respondents	26	7	5
	% of fac.	68.4%	18.4%	13.2%

Table 58

**Perceived Effectiveness of
AHLC Faculty Workshops**

Faculty Workshops for:		Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Useless	No Opinion
Writing instructional objectives	Number of respondents % of fac.	18 43.9%	10 24.4%	4 9.8%	9 22.0%
Design and preparation of instructional materials	Number of respondents % of fac.	16 39.0%	16 39.0%	3 7.3%	6 14.6
Design and production of modular instruction	Number of respondents % of fac.	10 25.6	18 46.2%	5 12.8%	6 15.4%
Allied Health faculty orientation	Number of respondents % of fac.	14 34.1%	10 24.4%	5 12.2%	12 29.3%
Determination of textbook readability	Number of respondents % of fac.	10 27.8%	15 41.7%	3 8.3%	8 22.2%
Systems approach to instruction	Number of respondents % of fac.	6 17.1%	8 22.9%	5 14.3%	16 45.7%
Techniques for valid student performance evaluation	Number of respondents % of fac.	7 19.4%	10 27.8%	5 13.9%	14 38.9%

Table 59

Perceived Effectiveness of AHLC
Modular Instruction for Student Use

Modular Instruction was		Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never
Helpful	Number of respondents	9	13	1	0
	% of fac.	39.1%	56.5%	4.3%	0.0%
In useable format	Number of respondents	8	13	1	0
	% of fac.	36.4%	59.1%	4.5%	0.0%
Available to students	Number of respondents	12	7	1	2
	% of fac.	54.5%	31.8%	4.5%	9.1%

Table 60

Perceived Value of AHLC to
Students and Faculty of N.Y.C.C.C.

		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Ophthalmic Dispensing	Radio. Tech.	Total
Extremely valuable	Number of respondents	0	5	0	1	10	1	0	17
	% of dept.	0.0%	45.5%	0.0%	5.3%	35.7%	16.7%	0.0%	
	% of total	0.0%	6.2%	0.0%	1.2%	12.3%	1.2%	0.0%	21.0%
Very valu- able	Number of respondents	4	5	2	11	5	5	3	35
	% of dept.	40.0%	45.5%	66.7%	57.9%	17.9%	83.3%	75.0%	
	% of total	4.9%	6.2%	2.5%	13.6%	6.2%	6.2%	3.7%	43.2%
Somewhat valuable	Number of respondents	6	1	1	7	12	0	1	28
	% of dept.	60.0%	9.1%	33.3%	36.8%	42.9%	0.0%	25.0%	
	% of total	6.9%	1.2%	1.2%	8.6%	14.8%	0.0%	1.2%	34.6%
Not valu- able	Number of respondents	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	% of dept.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	
	% of total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%

Table 61

Student Perceived Effectiveness of
Freshman Learning Skills Program

Objective:		Yes	Sometimes	No
Helped				
Improve reading skill	Number of respondents	65	17	30
	% of students	58.0%	15.2%	26.8%
Improve study skills	Number of respondents	41	30	37
	% of students	37.6%	27.5%	33.9%
Increase biostatistic understanding	Number of respondents	31	33	39
	% of students	30.1%	32.0%	37.9%
Increase confidence	Number of respondents	39	25	39
	% of students	37.9%	24.3%	37.9%
Provides a necessary service	Number of respondents	43	44	17
	% of students	41.3%	42.3%	16.3%

Table 62

Student Perceived Effectiveness
of Effective Reading Program

Objectives:

Helped		Yes	Sometimes	No
Improve reading rate	Number of respondents	79	25	37
	% of students	56.0%	17.7%	26.2%
Improve reading comprehension	Number of respondents	71	31	42
	% of students	49.3%	21.5%	29.2%
Increase confidence in ability	Number of respondents	55	35	48
	% of students	39.9%	25.4%	34.8%
Provides a necessary service	Number of respondents	67	35	31
	% of students	50.4%	26.3%	23.3%

Table 6)

Student Perceived Effectiveness
of Open Lab Program

Objectives:		Yes	Sometimes	No
Was assistance helpful	Number of respondents	74	22	12
	% of students	68.5%	20.4%	11.1%
Was assistance sufficient	Number of respondents	60	31	13
	% of students	57.7%	29.8%	12.5%
Were study guides helpful	Number of respondents	45	16	16
	% of students	58.4%	20.8%	20.8%
Were study materials helpful	Number of respondents	53	23	15
	% of students	58.2%	25.3%	16.5%

Table 64

Student Perceived Effectiveness
of Certification Seminars

Objective:

Increased		Yes	No
Knowledge in subject areas	Number of respondents	8	2
	% of students	80.0%	20.0%
Confidence in ability	Number of respondents	7	3
	% of students	70.0%	30.0%
Plan to attend future seminars	Number of respondents	99	117
	% of students	45.8%	54.2%

Table 65

Student Perceived Responsiveness of AHLC

		Yes	Sometimes	No
Responsive to students' needs	Number of respondents	82	109	86
	% of students	29.6%	39.4%	31.0%

Table 66

Students Perceived Effectiveness
of AHLC by Department

Rating:		Chemical Technology	Dental Hygiene	Dental Lab	Medical Lab	Nursing	Radiologic Technology	Total
Extremely helpful	Number of respondents	0	3	0	8	13	9	33
	% of dept.	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	4.6%	10.0%	19.1%	12.6%*
Very help- ful	Number of respondents	0	10	1	32	34	11	88
	% of dept.	0.0%	14.1%	5.9%	18.3%	26.2%	23.4%	33.6%*
Somewhat helpful	Number of respondents	1	27	2	29	34	6	99 *
	% of dept.	33.3%	38.0%	11.8%	16.6%	26.2%	12.8%	37.8%
Not very helpful	Number of respondents	0	14	1	5	2	1	23
	% of dept.	0.0%	19.7%	5.9%	2.9%	1.5%	2.1%	8.8%*
Useless	Number of respondents	0	13	2	1	2	1	19
	% of dept.	0.0%	18.3%	11.8%	0.6%	1.5%	2.1%	7.3%*

* Percent of total responding to this item

Appendix

Graduate Biography and Perceptions Questionnaire



New York City Community College

413

OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, 300 JAY STREET, BROOKLYN, N.Y. 11201

ALLIED HEALTH PROGRAM SURVEY

Please CIRCLE the number of the response that is your current answer to each multiple choice question. If the question requires a write-in answer, please PRINT your response.

1. Name:
2. Social Security Number:
3. Program:
4. What was your predominant attendance category?
1. Full time/Day 2. Part time/Day 3. Full time/Evening 4. Part time/Evening
5. What was your enrollment pattern?
1. Continuous 2. Non-continuous
6. What was your year of graduation?
1. 1968 2. 1969 3. 1970 4. 1971 5. 1972 6. 1973 7. 1974 8. 1975
7. Which year did you start New York City Community College (N.Y.C.C.C.)?
1. 1965 2. 1966 3. 1967 4. 1968 5. 1969 6. 1970 7. 1971 8. 1972 9. 1973
8. Did you transfer into N.Y.C.C.C. from another college and how many credits did you transfer .
0. Did not transfer in Number of credits transfered: _____ 2
9. If you transfered into N. Y. C. C. C., from what college did you transfer?

10. What is your present age?
1. 19 2. 20 3. 21 4. 22 5. 23 6. 24 7. 25-30 8. 30-40 9. over 40
11. What type of experience in the Health Field did you have before or during your enrollment in N. Y. C. C. C.?
0. None 1. Aide 2. Licensed Practical Nurse 3. Technical 4. Orderly(civilian)
5. Corpsman(military) 6. Transfer from Associate program
7. Transfer from BS program 8. Other _____
12. On the average, hom many hours per week were you employed for a salary during your enrollmant at N. Y. C. C. C.?
0. 0 hours 1. 1 to 10 hours 2. 10 to 20 hours 3. 20 to 30 hours
4. 30 to 40 hours 5. more than 40 hours per week

20 13. Are you currently employed in the field directly related to the department in which you were trained at N. Y. C. C. C.?

0. No 1. Yes, full time 2. Yes, part time

14. Who is your current employer? _____

15. What is your job title? _____

21 16. If you are not currently employed in the field for which you were directly trained at N. Y. C. C. C. indicate the main reason:

1. Continuing education 2. Serving in Armed Services 3. Inadequate salary
4. Married and/or raising children 5. Health reasons 6. Loss of interest
7. No jobs available 8. Not certified 9. Other (explain) _____

22 17. If you are not currently employed in the field for which you were trained and have changed to another health related field indicate the main reason:

0. Did not change fields 1. Better salary 2. More opportunity for advancement
3. More jobs available 4. More interesting Work

23 18. What is your current salary?

0. \$0.00 1. Below \$5000.00 2. \$5000 - \$7000 3. \$7001 - \$9000 4. \$9001-\$11,000
5. \$11,001 - \$13,000 6. \$13,001 - \$15,000 7. \$15001 - \$17,000 8. Over \$17,000

24 19. How many different positions have you had since you graduated from N. Y. C. C. C.

0. None 1. One 2. Two 3. Three 4. Four 5. Five 6. More than Five

25 20. What additional education after graduation from N.Y.C.C.C. have you undertaken (University, college, medical school, technical school etc.)?

0. None 1. Now attending full time 2. Attended full time, degree completed
3. Attended full time, withdrew 4. Now attending part time
5. Attended part time, degree completed 6. Attended part time, withdrew

26 21. If you continued your education and completed it, what degree did you receive?

0. None 1. B.A. 2. B.S. 3. M.A. 4. M.S. 5. MD/PhD 6. Other _____

22. If you continued your education, which institution(s) did you attend?

23. If you continued your education, what was your major field of study?

27 24. If you attended another institution, how many credits did you transfer from N.Y.C.C.C.?

0. None 1. 1 - 10 2. 11 - 20 3. 21 - 30 4. 31 - 40 5. 41 - 50 6. Over 50

28 25. In the performance of your duties in a health related position, are any of the techniques you use significantly different from those taught to you at N.Y.C.C.C.?

1. Yes 2. No.

26. If your answer to Question #25 was yes, identify the areas of greatest difference:

29 27. What is your overall impression of your N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum as preparation for your career?

1. Excellent 2. Very good 3. Good 4. Fair 5. Poor

For the following questions please check ONE box in each row

28. Please rate the following components of your General Education courses at N. Y. C. C. C. as a learning experiences:

	Excellent 1	Very Good 2	Good 3	Fair 4	Poor 5	Does not Apply 6
30 Lectures						
31 Class Discussions						
32 Laboratories						
33 Reading Materials						
34 Written Assignments						
35 Teacher Comments.						
36 Examinations						

29. Which of the following educational activities helped you most to complete your curriculum at N. Y. C. C. C.?

1. High School 2. Biology Audio-tutorial laboratory
 3. Allied Health Learning Center activities (certification seminars, freshman study skills course, study guides, open labs, etc.)
 4. Developmental skills program 5. Other _____

45. Please comment on any question in this study that you feel deserves additional comment:

30. Please rate the following components of your Career Learning courses at N. Y. C. C. C. as a learning experience:

	Excellent 1	Very Good 2	Good 3	Fair 4	Poor 5	Does not Apply 6
Lectures						
Class Discussions						
Laboratories						
Reading Materials						
Written Assignments						
Teacher Comments						
Examinations						

31. Please rate the following components of your Career Learning courses at N. Y. C. C. C. as to the amount of difficulty they presented to you:

	Extremely Difficult 1	Very Difficult 2	Somewhat Difficult 3	Not Difficult 4	Easy 5	Does not Apply 6
Lectures						
Class Discussions						
Laboratories						
Reading Materials						
Written Assignments						
Examinations						

On the following scales please circle the one rating that best describes MOST of your Career Learning instructors

32. Your Career Learning instructors as Teachers:

1. Inspirational 2. Very Interesting 3. Interesting 4. Uninteresting 5. Dull

33. Your Career Learning instructors in Class:

1. Very well prepared 2. Well prepared 3. Moderately prepared 4. Unprepared

34. Your Career Learning instructors regarding their Subject:

1. Enthusiastic 2. Interested 3. Some interest 4. Not interested 5. Negative

54 35. Your Career Learning instructors regarding their Students:

1. Very concerned 2. Concerned 3. Some concern 4. Unconcerned 5. Antagonistic

Please rate your Career Learning instructors according to the amount of extra help they provided to you.

	Very often 1	Often 2	Few times 3	Seldom 2	Never 5
55 36. How often did you seek individual help from your instructors?					
56 37. Did they provide extra assistance when needed?					
57 38. How often did your instructors offer individual help?					

58 39. Please rate your Career Learning instructors on each of the following:

	Always 1	Usually 2	Sometimes 3	Seldom 4	Never 5
59 Available for consultation					
60 Easy to talk to					
61 Helpful with Problems					
62 Helpful in Planning program					
63 Accurate Information					

40. If you have had an outstanding instructor, please write his/her name here:

64 41. How often did you see a College Counselor (other than your departmental Academic Advisor) during your enrollment at N.Y.C.C.C.?

0. Never 1. 1 - 2 times 3. 3 - 5 times 4. 6-10 times 5. 11-15 times 6. over 15

65 42. To the best of your knowledge, how often did cheating take place during examinations of Career Curriculum subjects at N.Y.C.C.C.?

0. Never 1. Rarely 2. Sometimes 3. Often 4. Very often 5. Always

43. List the three courses you have taken at N.Y.C.C.C. that have helped you most in your job experience:

44. List the three courses you have taken at N.Y.C.C.C. that have helped you least in your job experience:

Dental Hygiene Licensing Questionnaire



- 66 46. Did you take the National Board Dental Hygiene Licensing (NBDHL) Examination appropriate to your curriculum?
1. Yes 2. No
- 67 47. How many examination attempts were required for you to obtain licensing?
1. One 2. Two 3. Three 4. Four 5. Five 6. More than five 7. Did not pass
- 68 48. What is your overall impression of your N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum as preparation for the National Board Dental Hygiene Licensing (NBDHL) examination?
1. Excellent 2. Very Good 3. Good 4. Fair 5. Poor
49. How could you have been better prepared for Licensing? Please be specific.
-
-

- 69 50. Did you take any of the following examinations?
1. None 2. New York State Practical Examination (performance)
3. Northeast Regional Board Exam (performance) 4. Both

51. In the chart below, rate each section of the National Board Dental Hygiene Licensing examination in terms of your preparation at N.Y.C.C.C. and how difficult you found each section. Use the numbers on the following scale for ratings, placing one number in each box.

	1	2	3	4	5
	very poor preparation/ very difficult section	poor preparation/ difficult section	adequate preparation/ fair section	good preparation/ easy section	excellent preparation/ very easy section
	Section	your preparation at N. Y. C. C. C.		difficulty of section	
70	Oral Inspection				
71	Radiographs				
72	Diagnostic Aids				
73	Prophylaxis a. Hand Scaling				
74	b. Ultrasonics				
75	Topical Agents (fluorides)				
76	Oral Health Instruction (Nutrition, Plaque Control)				
77	Supportive Treatment (Dental Materials)				
	Emergencies				
	Community Health				

52. Please check the component of your Career Learning courses that was the best preparation for each section of the NBDH Licensing Examination:

	Labs 1	Reading Material 2	Written assignments 3	Exams 4	Review seminars 5	Lectures 6	Discussion 7
12 Oral Inspection							
13 Radiographs							
14 Diagnostic Aids							
15 Prophylaxis a. Hand Scaling							
16 b. Ultrasonics							
17 Topical Agents (fluorides)							
18 Oral Hlth. Inst. Nutrition							
19 Emergencies							
20 Supportive Trt. Dental Material							
21 Community Health							

53. On the following chart please check the item that was most helpful as preparation for each section of the NDBH Licensing Examination:

	Subject matter stressed 1	Presentation of material 2	Response to questions 3	Teachers comments 4	Individual assistance 5	Teaching aids 6
23 Oral Inspection						
24 Radiographs						
25 Diagnostic Aids						
26 Prophylaxis a. Hand Scaling						
27 b. Ultrasonics						
28 Topical Agents (fluorides)						
29 Oral Hlth. Inst. (Nutrition)						
30 Emergencies						
31 Supportive Trt. Dental Material						
32 Community Health						

Please rate each of your Career Learning courses
as preparation for each section of the NDBH Licensing Exam.

54. For the Oral Inspection section:

Very Useful Useful Useless Very Useless Does not
1 2 3 4 5
apply

	1	2	3	4	5
34 Oral Hygiene Theory					
35 Oral Hygiene Practice I					
36 Oral Anatomy					
37 Microbiology					
38 Oral Hygiene Practice II					
39 Dental Assisting					
40 Human Anatomy					
41 Organic Chemistry					
42 Pathology					
43 Oral Hygiene Practice III					
44 Pharmacology					
45 Dental Radiology Lab I					
46 Periodontics					
47 Public Health					
48 Oral Hygiene Practice IV					
49 Dental Materials					
50 Dental Radiology Lab II					
51 Current Concepts in Dentistry					
52 Dental Specialties					

Please rate each of your Career Learning courses as preparation for each section of the NBDH Licensing Exam.

55. For the Radiograph section:

	Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply
	1	2	3	4	5
55					
56					
57					
58					
59					
60					
61					
62					
63					
64					
65					
66					
67					
68					
69					
70					
71					
72					
73					

Please rate each of your Career Learning courses
as preparation for each section of the NBDH Licensing Exam.

56. For the Diagnostic Aids section:

SN-3		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply
		1	2	3	4	5
12	Oral Hygiene Theory					
13	Oral Hygiene Practice I					
14	Oral Anatomy					
15	Microbiology					
16	Oral Hygiene Practice II					
17	Dental Assisting					
18	Human Anatomy					
18	Organic Chemistry					
20	Pathology					
21	Oral Hygiene Practice III					
22	Pharmacology					
23	Dental Radiology Lab I					
24	Periodontics					
25	Public Health					
26	Oral Hygiene Practice IV					
27	Dental Materials					
28	Dental Radiology Lab II					
29	Current Concepts in Dentistry					
30	Dental Specialties					

Please rate each of your Career Learning courses as preparation for each section of the NBDH Licensing Exam.

57. For the Prophylaxis section a. Hand Scaling:

	Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply
	1	2	3	4	5
33					
34					
35					
36					
37					
38					
39					
40					
41					
42					
43					
44					
45					
46					
47					
48					
49					
50					
51					

Please rate each of your Career Learning courses
as preparation for each section of the NBDH Licensing Exam.

58. For the Prophylaxis section b. Ultrasonics:

	Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply
	1	2	3	4	5
54					
55					
56					
57					
58					
59					
60					
61					
62					
63					
64					
65					
66					
67					
68					
69					
70					
71					
72					

Please rate each of your Career Learning courses as preparation for each section of the NBDH Licensing Exam.

59. For the Topical Agents (fluorides) section

sn-4		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply
		1	2	3	4	5
12	Oral Hygiene Theory					
13	Oral Hygiene Practice I					
14	Oral Anatomy					
15	Microbiology					
16	Oral Hygiene Practice II					
17	Dental Assisting					
18	Human Anatomy					
19	Organic Chemistry					
20	Pathology					
21	Oral Hygiene Practice III					
22	Pharmacology					
23	Dental Radiology Lab I					
24	Periodontics					
25	Public Health					
26	Oral Hygiene Practice IV					
27	Dental Materials					
28	Dental Radiology Lab II					
29	Current Concepts in Dentistry					
30	Dental Specialties					

Please rate each of your Career Learning courses
as preparation for each section of the NBDH Licensing Exam.

60. For the Oral Health Instruction (Nutrition, Plaque Control) section:

Very Useful Useful Useless Very Useless Does not apply
1 2 3 4 5

33	Oral Hygiene Theory					
34	Oral Hygiene Practice I					
35	Oral Anatomy					
36	Microbiology					
37	Oral Hygiene Practice II					
38	Dental Assisting					
39	Human Anatomy					
40	Organic Chemistry					
41	Pathology					
42	Oral Hygiene Practice III					
43	Pharmacology					
44	Dental Radiology Lab I					
45	Periodontics					
46	Public Health					
47	Oral Hygiene Practice IV					
48	Dental Materials					
49	Dental Radiology Lab II					
50	Current Concepts in Dentistry					
51	Dental Specialties					

Please rate each of your Career Learning courses
as preparation for each section of the NBDH Licensing Exam.

61. For the Supportive Treatment (Dental Materials) section:

	Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply
	1	2	3	4	5
52					
53					
54					
55					
56					
57					
58					
59					
60					
61					
62					
63					
64					
65					
66					
67					
68					
69					
70					

Please rate each of your Career Learning courses as preparation for each section of the NBDH Licensing Exam.

62. For the Emergencies section:

sn-5

Very Useful Useful Useless Very Useless Does not apply
 1 2 3 4 5

Oral Hygiene Theory					
Oral Hygiene Practice I					
Oral Anatomy					
Microbiology					
Oral Hygiene Practice II					
Dental Assisting					
Human Anatomy					
Organic Chemistry					
Pathology					
Oral Hygiene Practice III					
Pharmacology					
Dental Radiology Lab I					
Periodontics					
Public Health					
Oral Hygiene Practice IV					
Dental Materials					
Dental Radiology Lab II					
Current Concepts in Dentistry					
Dental Specialties					

Please rate each of your Career Learning courses
as preparation for each section of the NBDH Licensing Exam.

63. For the Community Health section:

	Very Useful 1	Useful 2	Useless 3	Very Useless 4	Does not apply 5
31 Oral Hygiene Theory					
32 Oral Hygiene Practice I					
33 Oral Anatomy					
34 Microbiology					
35 Oral Hygiene Practice II					
36 Dental Assisting					
37 Human Anatomy					
38 Organic Chemistry					
39 Pathology					
40 Oral Hygiene Practice III					
41 Pharmacology					
42 Dental Radiology Lab I					
43 Periodontics					
44 Public Health					
45 Oral Hygiene Practice IV					
46 Dental Materials					
47 Dental Radiology Lab II					
48 Current Concepts in Dentistry					
49 Dental Specialties					

64. Please rate your Career Learning courses as preparation for the Real World:

	Very Useful 1	Useful 2	Useless 3	Very Useless 4	Does not apply 5
50					
51					
52					
53					
54					
55					
56					
57					
58					
59					
60					
61					
62					
63					
64					
65					
66					
67					
68					

65. Please rate your Career Learning instructors for their help in preparing you for the Certification Examination sections:

	Excellent 1	Very Good 2	Good 3	Fair 4	Poor 5
69 Oral Inspection					
70 Radiographs					
71 Diagnostic Aids					
72 Prophylaxis					
73 a. Hand Scaling					
74 b. Ultrasonics					
75 Topical Agents					
76 Oral Health Instruct.					
77 Supportive Treatment					
78 Emergencies					
Community Health					

66. Which year did you take the National Board Dental Hygiene Licensing Exam?

- 79 0. Did not take 1. 1968 2. 1969 3. 1970 4. 1971 5. 1972
6. 1973 7. 1974 8. 1975

If the exam was taken more than once, please circle all years in which it was taken.

Medical Laboratory Certification Questionnaire



66 46. Did you take the MLT/ASCP Certification Examination appropriate to your curriculum?

1. Yes 2. No

67 47. How many examination attempts were required for you to pass the MLT/ASCP Certification Examination?

1. One 2. Two 3. Three 4. Four 5. Five 6. More than five 7. Did not pass

68 48. What is your overall impression of your N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum as preparation for the MLT/ASCP Certification Examination?

1. Excellent 2. Very good 3. Good 4. Fair 5. Poor

49. How could you have been better prepared for certification? Please be specific.

69 50. Did you take any of the following examinations?

1. None 2. Medical Tech/ASCP 3. N.Y.C. Dept. of Health Certificate (Med. Technologist)
 4. N.Y.C. Dept. of Health Cert. (Med. Technician) Other _____

51. In the chart below, rate each section of the Certification Examination MLT/ASCP in terms of your preparation at N.Y.C.C.C. and how difficult you found each section. Use the numbers on the following scale for ratings, placing one number in each box.

1	2	3	4	5
very poor preparation/very difficult section	poor preparation/difficult section	adequate preparation/fair section	good preparation/easy section	excellent preparation/very easy section

	your preparation at N. Y. C. C. C.	difficulty of section
70 Microbiology		
71 Serology		
72 Clinical Chemistry		
73 Hematology		
74 Urinalysis		
75 Blood Banking		
Parasitology		

52. Please check the component of your Career Learning courses that was the best preparation for each section of the MLT/ASCP Certification Examination.

sn-2		Labs 1	Reading Material 2	Written Assignments 3	Exams 4	Review Seminars 5	Lectures 6	Discussions 7
12	Microbiology							
13	Serology							
14	Clinical Chemistry							
15	Hematology							
16	Urinalysis							
17	Blood Banking							
18	Parasitology							

53. On the following chart please check the item that was most helpful as preparation for each section of the MLT/ASCP Certification Examination.

	Subject matter stressed 1	Presentation of material 2	Response to questions 3	Teachers comments 4	Individual assistance 5	Teaching aids 6
19	Microbiology					
20	Serology					
21	Clinical Chemistry					
22	Hematology					
23	Urinalysis					
24	Blood Banking					
25	Parasitology					

Please rate your Career Learning courses as preparation for each section of the Certification exam.

54. For the Microbiology section:

	Very Useful 1	Useful 2	Useless 3	Very Useless 4	Does not apply 5
26 Clinical Lab Science I (Hematlg)					
27 Microbiology I					
28 Clinical Lab Science II (Cl.Chem)					
29 Histology					
30 Microbiology II					
31 Clinical Lab Practice (Hospital)					

55. For the Serology section:

	Very useful 1	Useful 2	Useless 3	Very Useless 4	Does not apply 5
32 Clinical Lab Science I (Hematlg)					
33 Microbiology I					
34 Clinical Lab Science II (Cl.Chem)					
35 Histology					
36 Microbiology II					
37 Clinical Lab Practice (Hospital)					

56. For the Clinical Chemistry section:

	Very Useful 1	Useful 2	Useless 3	Very Useless 4	Does not apply 5
38 Clinical Lab Science I (Hematlg)					
39 Microbiology I					
40 Clinical Lab Science II (Cl.Chem)					
41 Histology					
42 Microbiology II					
43 Clinical Lab Practice (Hospital)					

Please rate your Career Learning courses as preparation for each section of the Certification exam.

57. For the Hematology section:

	Very Useful 1	Useful 2	Useless 3	Very Useless 4	Does not apply 5
44 Clinical Lab Science I (Hematlgy)					
45 Microbiology I					
46 Clinical Lab Science II (Cl.Chem)					
47 Histology					
48 Microbiology II					
49 Clinical Lab Practice (Hospital)					

58. For the Urinalysis section:

	Very useful 1	Useful 2	Useless 3	Very Useless 4	Does not apply 5
50 Clinical Lab Science I (Hematlgy)					
51 Microbiology I					
52 Clinical Lab Science II (Cl.Chem)					
53 Histology					
54 Microbiology II					
55 Clinical Lab Practice (Hospital)					

59. For the Blood Banking section:

	Very Useful 1	Useful 2	Useless 3	Very Useless 4	Does not apply 5
56 Clinical Lab Science I (Hematlgy)					
57 Microbiology I					
58 Clinical Lab Science II (Cl.Chem)					
59 Histology					
60 Microbiology II					
Clinical Lab Practice (Hospital)			4 5 6		

Please rate your Career Learning courses as preparation for each section of the Certification exam.

60. For the Parasitology section:

	Very Useful 1	Useful 2	Useless 3	Very Useless 4	Does not apply 5
62 Clinical Lab Science I (Hemotlgy)					
63 Microbiology I					
64 Clinical Lab Science II (Cl.Chem)					
65 Histology					
66 Microbiology II					
67 Clinical Lab Practice (Hospital)					

61. Please rate your career learning courses as preparation for the Real World:

	Very useful 1	Useful 2	Useless 3	Very Useless 4	Does not apply 5
68 Clinical Lab Science I (Hemotlgy)					
69 Microbiology I					
70 Clinical Lab Science II (Cl.Chem)					
71 Histology					
72 Microbiology II					
73 Clinical Lab Practice (Hospital)					

62. Please rate your Career Learning instructors for their help in preparing you for each Certification Exam section:

sn-3	Excellent 1	Very Good 2	Good 3	Fair 4	Poor 5
12 Microbiology					
13 Serology					
14 Clinical Chemistry					
15 Hematology					
16 Urinalysis					
17 Blood Banking					
Parasitology					

63. Which year did you take the MLT/ASCP Certification Examination?

19

0. Did not take 1. 1968 2. 1969 3. 1970 4. 1971 5. 1972
6. 1973 7. 1974 8. 1975

Nursing Licensing Questionnaire



66 46. Did you take the New York State Board Licensure Examination appropriate to your curriculum?

1. Yes 2. No

67 47. How many examination attempts were required for you to pass the New York State Board Licensure Examination?

1. One 2. Two 3. Three 4. Four 5. Five 6. More than five 7. Did not pass

68 48. What is your overall impression of your N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum as preparation for the New York State Board Licensure Examination?

1. Excellent 2. Very good 3. Good 4. Fair 5. Poor

49. How could you have been better prepared for licensure? please be specific.

50.

Please note: all references to Licensure refer to the New York State Board Licensure Examination.

51. In the chart below, please rate each section of the licensure examination in terms of your preparation at N.Y.C.C.C. and how difficult you found each section. Use the numbers on the following scale for ratings, placing one number in each box.

	1	2	3	4	5
	Very poor preparation/ very difficult section	poor preparation/ difficult section	adequate preparation/ fair section	good preparation/ easy section	excellent preparation/ very easy section

	your preparation at N. Y. C. C. C.	difficulty of section
70 Medical		
71 Surgical		
72 Obstetrics		
73 Pediatrics		
74 Psychiatry		

52. Please check the component of your Career Learning courses that was the best preparation for each section of the Licensure Examination.

sn-2

	Labs	Reading material	Written assignments	Exams	Review seminars	Lectures	Discussions
	1	2	2	4	5	6	7
12	Medical						
13	Surgical						
14	Obstetrics						
15	Pediatrics						
16	Psychiatry						

53. On the following chart please check the item that was most helpful as preparation for each section of the Licensure Examination.

	Subject matter stressed	Presentation of material	Response to questions	Teachers comments	Individual assistance	Teaching aids
	1	2	3	4	5	6
17	Medical					
18	Surgical					
19	Obstetrics					
20	Pediatrics					
21	Psychiatry					

Rate your Career Learning courses as preparation for each section of the Examination

54. For the Medical section:

	Very Useful 1	Useful 2	Useless 3	Very Useless 4	Does not apply 5
Fundamentals of Nursing					
Microbiology					
Intro. to Psychology					
Maternal Health					
Psychiatric Nursing					
Anatomy and Physiology I					
Child Psychology					
Adult and Child Nursing I					
Adult and Child Nursing II					
Anatomy and Physiology II					
Psychology of Adolescence					
Adult and Child Nursing III					
Adult and Child Nursing IV					

55. For the Surgical section:

	Very Useful 1	Useful 2	Useless 3	Very Useless 4	Does not apply 5
Fundamentals of Nursing					
Microbiology					
Intro. to Psychology					
Maternal Health					
Psychiatric Nursing					
Anatomy and Physiology I					
Child Psychology					
Adult and Child Nursing I					
Adult and Child Nursing II					
Anatomy and Physiology II					
Psychology of Adolescence					
Adult and Child Nursing III					
Adult and Child Nursing IV					

Rate your Career Learning courses as preparation for each section of the Examination

56. For the Obstetrics section:

	Very Useful 1	Useful 2	Useless 3	Very Useless 4	Does not apply 5
48					
49					
50					
51					
52					
53					
54					
55					
56					
57					
58					
59					
60					

57. For the Pediatrics section:

	Very Useful 1	Useful 2	Useless 3	Very Useless 4	Does not apply 5
61					
62					
63					
64					
65					
66					
67					
68					
69					
70					
71					
72					
		473			

Rate your Career Learning courses as preparation for each section of the Examination

58. For the Psychiatry section:

sn-3		Very Useful 1	Useful 2	Useless 3	Very Useless 4	Does not apply 5
12	Fundamentals of Nursing					
13	Microbiology					
14	Intro. to Psychology					
15	Maternal Health					
16	Psychiatric Nursing					
17	Anatomy and Physiology I					
18	Child Psychology					
19	Adult and Child Nursing I					
20	Adult and Child Nursing II					
21	Anatomy and Physiology II					
22	Psychology of Adolescence					
23	Adult and Child Nursing III					
24	Adult and Child Nursing IV					

59. Please rate your Career Learning courses as preparation for the Real World:

		Very Useful 1	Useful 2	Useless 3	Very Useless 4	Does not apply 5
25	Fundamentals of Nursing					
26	Microbiology					
27	Intro. to Psychology					
28	Maternal Health					
29	Psychiatric Nursing					
30	Anatomy and Physiology I					
31	Child Psychology					
32	Adult and Child Nursing I					
33	Adult and Child Nursing II					
34	Anatomy and Physiology II					
35	Psychology of Adolescence					
36	Adult and Child Nursing III					
	Adult and Child Nursing IV					

60. Please rate your Career Learning instructors for their help in preparing you for each section of the Licensure Examination.

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
	1	2	3	4	5
38 Medical					
39 Surgical					
40 Obstetrics					
41 Pediatrics					
42 Psychiatry					

61. Which year did you take the New York State Board Licensure Examination?

0. did not take. 1. 1968 2. 1969 3. 1970 4. 1971 5. 1972
 6. 1973 7. 1974 8. 1975

Ophthalmic Dispensing Licensure Questionnaire



66 46. Did you take the New York State Board for Ophthalmic Dispensary Licensure Examination?

1. Yes 2. No

67 47. How many examination attempts were required for you to pass the N. Y. S. Bd. Exam.

1. One 2. Two 3. Three 4. Four 5. Five 6. More than five 7. Did not pass

68 48. What is your overall impression of your N. Y. C. C. C. Curriculum as preparation for the N. Y. State Board for Ophthalmic Dispensary Licensure?

1. Excellent 2. Very Good 3. Good 4. Fair 5. Poor

49. How could you have been better prepared for Licensure? Please be specific.

69 50. Did you take the American Bd. of Opticianary Certification Examination?

1. Yes 2. No

51. In the chart below, please rate each section of the N. Y. State Board for Ophthalmic Dispensary Licensure Examination in terms of your preparation at N.Y.C.C.C. and how difficult you found each section. Use the numbers on the following scale for ratings, placing one number in each box.

1	2	3	4	5
very poor preparation/ very difficult section	poor preparation/ difficult section	adequate preparation/ fair section	good preparation/ easy section	excellent preparation/ very easy section

	your preparation at N. Y. C. C. C.	difficulty of section
70 Theoretical Optics		
71 Anatomy/ Physiology		
72 Ophthalmic Dispensing		
73 Ophthalmic Materials		
74 Ophthalmic Optics		
75 Practical Dispensing		
76 Contact Lenses Written		
77 Contact Lenses Oral Procedures		
78 Contact Lenses Fitting		
Contact Lenses Practical		

Please Note: all reference to Licensure refers to the New York State Board for Ophthalmic Dispensary Licensure Examination

52. Please check the component of your Career Learning courses that was the best preparation for each section of the Licensure Examination.

sn-2

	Labs	Reading Material	Written assignments	Exams	Review seminars	Lectures	Discussion
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12 Theoretical Optics							
13 Anatomy/ Physiology							
14 Ophthalmic Dispensing							
15 Ophthalmic Materials							
16 Ophthalmic Optics							
17 Practical Dispensing							
18 Contact Lens Written							
19 Contact Lens Oral							
20 Contact Lens Fitting							
21 Contact Lens Practical							

53. On the following chart please check the item that was most helpful as preparation for each section of the Licensure Examination.

	Subject matter stressed	Presentation of material	Response to questions	Teachers comments	Individual assistance	Teaching aids
	1	2	3	4	5	6
22 Theoretical Optics						
23 Anatomy/ Physiology						
24 Ophthalmic Dispensing						
25 Ophthalmic Materials						
26 Ophthalmic Optics						
27 Practical Dispensing						
28 Contact Lens Written						
29 Contact Lens Oral						
30 Contact Lens Fitting						
31 Contact Lens Practical			478			

Please rate your Career Learning courses as preparation for each section of the Licensure Examination.

54. For the Theoretical Optics section:

Very Useful Useful Useless Very Useless Does not apply

1 2 3 4 5

32	Ophthalmic materials I					
33	Ophthalmic materials II					
34	Anatomy and Physiology of Eye					
35	Principles of Optics I					
36	Ophthalmic materials III					
37	Ophthalmic Dispensing I					
38	Principles of Optics II					
39	Contact Lenses I					
40	Ophthalmic Dispensing II					
41	Special Visual Aids					
42	Contact Lenses II					

55. For the Anatomy/Physiology section:

Very Useful Useful Useless Very Useless Does not apply

1 2 3 4 5

43	Ophthalmic materials I					
44	Ophthalmic materials II					
45	Anatomy and Physiology of Eye					
46	Principles of Optics I					
47	Ophthalmic materials III					
48	Ophthalmic Dispensing I					
49	Principles of Optics II					
50	Contact Lenses I					
51	Ophthalmic Dispensing II					
52	Special Visual Aids					
	Contact Lenses II					

Please rate your Career Learning courses as preparation for each section of the Licensure Examination.

56. For the Ophthalmic Dispensing section:

	Very Useful 1	Useful 2	Useless 3	Very Useless 4	Does not apply 5
54					
55					
56					
57					
58					
59					
60					
61					
62					
63					
64					

57. For the Ophthalmic Materials section:

	Very Useful 1	Useful 2	Useless 3	Very Useless 4	Does not apply 5
65					
66					
67					
68					
69					
70					
71					
72					
73					
74					
		480			

Please rate your Career Learning courses as preparation for each section of the Licensure Examination.

58. For the Ophthalmic Optics section:

sn-3		Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply
		1	2	3	4	5
12	Ophthalmic materials I					
13	Ophthalmic materials II					
14	Anatomy and Physiology of Eye					
15	Principles of Optics I					
16	Ophthalmic materials III					
17	Ophthalmic Dispensing I					
18	Principles of Optics II					
18	Contact Lenses I					
20	Ophthalmic Dispensing II					
21	Special Visual Aids					
22	Contact Lenses II					

59. For the Practical Dispensing Section:

	Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply
	1	2	3	4	5
23	Ophthalmic materials I				
24	Ophthalmic materials II				
25	Anatomy and Physiology of Eye				
26	Principles of Optics I				
27	Ophthalmic materials III				
28	Ophthalmic Dispensing I				
29	Principles of Optics II				
30	Contact Lenses I				
31	Ophthalmic Dispensing II				
32	Special Visual Aids				
33	Contact Lenses II		481		

Please rate your Career Learning courses as preparation for each section of the Licensure Examination.

60. For the Contact Lenses written section:

	Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply
	1	2	3	4	5
34					
35					
36					
37					
38					
39					
40					
41					
42					
43					
44					

61. For the Contact Lenses Oral Procedured section:

	Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply
	1	2	3	4	5
45					
46					
47					
48					
49					
50					
51					
52					
53					
54					
		482			

Please rate your Career Learning courses as preparation for each section of the Licensure Examination.

62. For the Contact Lenses Fitting section:

	Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply
	1	2	3	4	5
56					
57					
58					
59					
60					
61					
62					
63					
64					
65					
66					

63. For the Contact Lenses Practical section:

	Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply
	1	2	3	4	5
67					
68					
69					
70					
71					
72					
73					
74					
75					
76		483			
77					

64. Please rate your Career Learning courses as preparation for the Real World.

sn-4	Very Useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply
	1	2	3	4	5
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					

65. Please rate your Career Learning instructors for their help in preparing you for each of the Licensure Examination sections:

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
	1	2	3	4	5
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
29					
30					
31					
32					

66. Which year did you take the N. Y. S. Bd. Ophthalmic Dispensary Examination?

- 33
0. Did not take 1. 1968 2. 1969 3. 1970 4. 1971 5. 1972
6. 1973 7. 1974 8. 1975

Radiologic Technology Licensure Questionnaire



46. Did you take the New York State Licensing Examination appropriate to your curriculum?

1. Yes 2. No

47. How many examination attempts were required for you to pass the Licensing Exam.

1. One 2. Two 3. Three 4. Four 5. Five 6. More than five 7. Didn't pass

48. What is your overall impression of your N.Y.C.C.C. curriculum as preparation for the New York State Licensing Examination?

1. Excellent 2. Very Good 3. Good 4. Fair 5. Poor

49. How could you have been better prepared for licensing? Please be specific.

50. Did you take the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists registry exam?

1. Yes 2. No.

51. In the chart below, please rate each section of the New York State Licensing Examination in terms of your preparation at N.Y.C.C.C., and how difficult you found each section. Use the numbers on the following scale for ratings, placing one number in each box.

1	2	3	4	5
very poor preparation/ very difficult section	poor preparation/ difficult section	adequate preparation/ fair section	good preparation/ easy section	excellent preparation/ very easy section

	your preparation at N. Y. C. C. C.	difficulty of section
Radiographic Techniques		
Standard Position		
Anatomy/Physiology		
X-ray Physics		
Radiation Therapy		
Special Procedures		
General Physics		
Therapy		

52. Please check the component of your Career Learning courses that was the best preparation for each section of the Licensing Examination:

sn-2

Labs Reading Written Exams Review Lectures Discussion
 Material assignments seminars
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12	Radiographic Techniques						
13	Standard Positioning						
14	Anatomy/Physiology						
15	X-ray Physics						
16	Radiation Therapy						
17	Special Procedures						
18	General Physics						
19	Therapy						

53. On the following chart please check the item that was most helpful as preparation for each section of the Licensing Examination:

Subject matter stressed Presentation of material Response to questions Teachers comments Individual assistance Teaching aids

23	Radiographic Techniques	1	2	3	4	5	6
24	Standard Positioning						
25	Anatomy/Physiology						
26	X-ray Physics						
27	Radiation Therapy						
28	Special Procedures						
29	General Physics						
30	Therapy						

Please rate your Career Learning courses as preparation for each section of the Licensing Examination.

54. For the Radiographic Techniques section:

Very Useful Useful Useless Very Useless Does not apply
 1 2 3 4 5

		1	2	3	4	5
34	Radiologic Technic I					
35	Radiologic Technic Lab I					
36	Positioning I					
37	Gross Anatomy I					
38	Radiologic Technic II					
39	Radiologic Technic Lab II					
40	Positioning II					
41	Clinical Practice I					
42	Gross Anatomy II					
43	Clinical Practice II					
44	Medical/Surgical Diseases					
45	Positioning III					
46	Patient Care					
47	Radiologic Technic III					
48	Clinical Practice III					
49	X-ray Physics					
50	Radiation Therapy					
51	Dental Radiography					
52	Special Procedures					
53	Clinical Practice IV					
54	Clinical Practice V					

Please rate your Career Learning courses as preparation for each section of the Licensing Examination.

55. For the Standard Positioning section:

	Very useful 1	Useful 2	Useless 3	Very Useless 4	Does not apply 5
55					
56					
57					
58					
59					
60					
61					
62					
63					
64					
65					
66					
67					
68					
69					
70					
71					
72					
73					
74					
75					

Please rate your Career Learning courses as preparation for each section of the Licensing Examination.

56. For the Anatomy/Physiology section:

	Very useful	Useful	Useless	Very Useless	Does not apply
	1	2	3	4	5
12 Radiologic Technic I					
13 Radiologic Technic Lab I					
14 Positioning I					
15 Gross Anatomy I					
16 Radiologic Technic II					
17 Radiologic Technic Lab II					
18 Positioning II					
19 Clinical Practice I					
20 Gross Anatomy II					
21 Clinical Practice II					
22 Medical/Surgical Diseases					
23 Positioning III					
24 Patient Care					
25 Radiologic Technic III					
26 Clinical Practice III					
27 X-ray Physics					
28 Radiation Therapy					
29 Dental Radiography					
30 Special Procedures					
31 Clinical Practice IV					
32 Clinical Practice V					

Please rate your Career Learning courses as preparation for each section of the Licensing Examination.

57. For the X-ray Physics section:

	Very useful 1	Useful 2	Useless 3	Very Useless 4	Does not apply 5
33					
34					
35					
36					
37					
38					
39					
40					
41					
42					
43					
44					
45					
46					
47					
48					
49					
50					
51					
52					
53					

Please rate your Career Learning courses as preparation for each section of the Licensing Examination.

58. For the Radiation Therapy section:

	Very useful 1	Useful 2	Useless 3	Very Useless 4	Does not apply 5
Radiologic Technic I					
Radiologic Technic Lab I					
Positioning I					
Gross Anatomy I					
Radiologic Technic II					
Radiologic Technic Lab II					
Positioning II					
Clinical Practice I					
Gross Anatomy II					
Clinical Practice II					
Medical/Surgical Diseases					
Positioning III					
Patient Care					
Radiologic Technic III					
Clinical Practice III					
X-ray Physics					
Radiation Therapy					
Dental Radiography					
Special Procedures					
Clinical Practice IV					
Clinical Practice V					

Please rate your Career Learning courses as preparation for each section of the Licensing Examination.

59. For the Special Procedures section:

sn- 4	Very useful 1	Useful 2	Useless 3	Very Useless 4	Does not apply 5
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
29					
30					
31					
32					

Please rate your Career Learning courses as preparation for each section of the Licensing Examiner.

60. For the General Physics section:

	Very useful 1	Useful 2	Useless 3	Very Useless 4	Does not apply 5
3 Radiologic Technic I					
4 Radiologic Technic Lab I					
5 Positionong I					
6 Gross Anatomy I					
7 Radiologic Technic II					
8 Radiologic Technic Lab II					
9 Positioning II					
0 Clinical Practice I					
1 Gross Anatomy II					
2 Clinical Practice II					
3 Medical/Surgical Diseases					
4 Positioning III					
5 Patient Care					
6 Radiologic Technic III					
7 Clinical Practice III					
8 X-ray Physics					
9 Radiation Therapy					
50 Dental Radiography					
Special Procedures					
1 Clinical Practice IV					
53 Clinical Practice V					

Please rate your Career Learning courses as preparation for each section of the Licensing Examination.

61. For the Therapy section:

	Very useful 1	Useful 2	Useless 3	Very Useless 4	Does not apply 5
54					
55					
56					
57					
58					
59					
60					
61					
62					
63					
64					
65					
66					
67					
68					
69					
70					
71					
72					
73					
74					

62. Please rate your Career Learning courses as preparation for the Real World:

sn-5

Very useful Useful Useless Very Useless Does not apply
 1 2 3 4 5

	1	2	3	4	5
Radiologic Technic I					
Radiologic Technic Lab I					
14 Positioning I					
Gross Anatomy I					
Radiologic Technic II					
17 Radiologic Technic Lab II					
Positioning II					
Clinical Practice I					
20 Gross Anatomy II					
Clinical Practice II					
2 Medical/Surgical Diseases					
23 Positioning III					
2 Patient Care					
2 Radiologic Technic III					
26 Clinical Practice III					
2 X-ray Physics					
2 Radiation Therapy					
29 Dental Radiography					
3 Special Procedures					
3 Clinical Practice IV					
32 Clinical Practice V					

63. Please rate your Career Learning instructors for their help in preparing you for each section of the Licensing Examination:

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
	1	2	3	4	5
33 Radiographic Techniques					
34 Standard Positioning					
35 Anatomy/Physiology					
36 X-ray Physics					
37 Radiation Therapy					
38 Special Procedures					
39 General Physics					
40 Therapy					

64. Which year did you take the New York State Licensing Examination?

- 41 0. Did not take 1. 1968 2. 1969 3. 1970 4. 1971 5. 1972
 6. 1973 7. 1974 8. 1975

Faculty Perceptions Questionnaire



New York City Community College

OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, 300 JAY STREET, BROOKLYN, N.Y. 11201

ALLIED HEALTH PROGRAM SURVEY Faculty Perception Questionnaire

Please CIRCLE the number of the response that is your current answer to each multiple choice question. If the question requires a write-in answer, please PRINT your response.

1. What is your position?

1. Faculty, full time 2. Faculty, part time, day 3. Faculty, part time, evening
 4. Faculty, adjunct 5. Other (specify) _____

2. What is your rank?

1. Professor 2. Associate Prof. 3. Assistant Prof. 4. Lecturer
 5. Instructor 6. Other (specify) _____

3. What is your length of service at N.Y.C.C.C.?

_____ years

4. What is your teaching experience prior to coming to N.Y.C.C.C.?

_____ years

5. What department are you in?

1. Chemical Tech. 2. Dental Hygiene 3. Dental Lab. 4. Medical Lab.
 5. Nursing 6. Ophthalmic Dispensing 7. Radiologic Tech.
 8. Other (specify) _____

6. Are you tenured?

1. Yes 2. No

7. What courses do you teach during the academic year?

9

8. Please complete the following chart indicating the approximate percentage of your teaching load required for each function.

Function	Percent for Classroom and/or Lab	Percent for Certification Exam
21 Lectures		
25 Seminars		
29 Laboratory		
33 Individualized Instruction		
37 Evaluation and Testing		
41 Other (specify)		

9. Please indicate the extensiveness of your use of the following techniques in your courses.

	Always 1	Usually 2	Sometimes 3	Rarely 4	Never 5	Not Applic. 6
42 Pass/Fail Examinations						
43 Curve Grading						
44 Behavioral Objectives						
45 Individualized Instruction						
46 Audio/Visual Media						

10. Please indicate your perceptions of the academic quality of the department and students entering the program as listed below.

	Very High 1	High 2	Average 3	Low 4	Very Low 5
47 Department, prior to open admissions					
48 Students, prior to open admissions					
49 Department, currently					
50 Current students, regular admission					
51 Current students, open admission					

11. How important do you believe it is for students in your department to pass the appropriate certification/licensure examination?

- 52 1. Extremely important 2. Very important 3. Important 4. Unimportant
5. No opinion 6. Not applicable

12. Please indicate which is most important to graduates of your department relative to the certification/licensure examination.

- 53 1. Passing 2. Obtaining a high score 3. Not applicable

13. What is your perception of the occurrence of cheating on examinations in your department?

- 54 1. Always 2. Usually 3. Sometimes 4. Rarely 5. Never

14. Has the implementation of student evaluation influenced your instructional practices in any of the following areas?

Yes 1 No 2

55 Lectures		
56 Seminars		
57 Laboratories		
58 Testing		
59 Grading		
60 Individual Assistance		

15. How many students do you believe have advanced through the program without having received the necessary knowledge or skills for advanced courses?

- 61 1. 75%-100% 2. 50%-75% 3. 25%-50% 4. 10%-25% 5. less than 10%
6. none

16. Do you believe graduates of the program have acquired the necessary knowledge and skills to perform satisfactorily on the job?

- 62 1. Yes 2. No

In answering the following questions, please be as specific as possible.

17. What criteria do you use to determine when a student is ready for advancement from one laboratory course to a more advanced laboratory course?

66

18. What do you perceive to be weaknesses in the program and how can they be corrected?

70

19. How can the students be better served by the department?

73

20. Please describe your perceptions of the typical open admissions student entering your department.

76

Employer Perceptions Questionnaires



New York City Community College

OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, 300 JAY STREET, BROOKLYN, N.Y. 11201

ALLIED
HEALTH
DEPARTMENT
SURVEY

EMPLOYER EVALUATION

MEDICAL LABORATORY TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT

Please consider graduates of the above referenced program ONLY when responding.

Please CIRCLE the number of the response that is your current answer to each multiple choice question. If the question requires a write-in answer, please PRINT your response.

1. Organization name _____
Your name _____
Address _____
2. Do you have any graduates of the above program of New York City Community College (N.Y.C.C.C.) in your employ at this time?
1. Yes 2. No
3. How many graduates of the above program of New York City Community College are you currently employing?
_____ graduates
4. Have you employed any graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. in the past?
1. Yes 2. No
5. What is the total number of graduates of the above program at N.Y.C.C.C. that you have employed, not including those currently employed?
_____ graduates
6. How many graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. have been superior to the average entry level employee?
1. None 2. Very few 3. Some 4. Most 5. All
7. How many graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. have been inferior to the average entry level employee?
1. None 2. Very few 3. Some 4. Most 5. All
8. How much orientation and/or in-service training do you expect to provide the average new employee?
_____ number of hours
9. How much orientation and/or in-service training is required for a typical N.Y.C.C.C. graduate of the above program?
_____ number of hours
10. Do you expect to employ future graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. if you hire specialists in the future?
1. Yes 2. No
11. Please indicate where your hiring emphasis will be for the next five years.
1. Associate degree level 2. Baccalaureate degree level 3. No emphasis
4. Can't forecast 5. Don't plan to hire 6. Other: _____

12. On the chart below, please rate the Initial Entry Characteristics of most of the N. Y. C. C. C. graduates in your employ, in each area specified.

Excellent Very good Good Fair Poor Not Acceptable Doesn't Apply

26	Technical competency						
27	Technical knowledge						
28	Theoretical knowledge						
29	Manipulative skills						
30	Communication skills, oral						
31	Communication skills, written						
32	Mathematic competency						
33	Basic science background						
34	Adaptability						
35	Responsibility						
36	Reliability						
37	Punctuality						
38	Peer relationships						
39	Supervisor relationships						
40	Client/patient relationships						
41	Initiative						
42	Cooperation						
43	Enthusiasm						
44	Organizational loyalty						
45	Personal appearance						
46	Overall rating						

13. If you have terminated the employment of a NYCCC graduate for unsatisfactory performance, circle the reasons:

1. Technical competence 2. Technical knowledge 3. Theoretical knowledge 4. Manipulative skills
 5. Communication skills, oral 6. Communication skills, written 7. Adatability 8. Responsibility
 9. Reliability 10. Punctuality 11. Peer relationships 12. Supervisor Relationships 13. Initiative
 14. Client/patient relationships 15. Cooperation 16. Enthusiasm 17. Organizational loyalty
 18. Personal appearance 19. Other (please specify) _____

14. Have you had opportunities to make your employment needs known to the appropriate departments at N. Y. C. C. C.?

1. Yes 2. No

15. If the means were available, would you make your needs and opinions known to N.Y.C.C.C. on a regular basis?

1. Yes 2. No

16. Please tell us how we may better prepare our graduates for employment in your organization. Please be specific.



New York City Community College

OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, 300 JAY STREET, BROOKLYN, N.Y. 11201

ALLIED
HEALTH
DEPARTMENT
SURVEY

EMPLOYER EVALUATION

DENTAL LABORATORY DEPARTMENT

Please consider graduates of the above referenced program ONLY when responding.

Please CIRCLE the number of the response that is your current answer to each multiple choice question. If the question requires a write-in answer, please PRINT your response.

1. Organization name _____
Your name _____
5. Address _____
2. Do you have any graduates of the above program of New York City Community College (N.Y.C.C.C.) in your employ at this time?
10 1. Yes 2. No
3. How many graduates of the above program of New York City Community College are you currently employing?
11 _____ graduates
4. Have you employed any graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. in the past?
13 1. Yes 2. No
5. What is the total number of graduates of the above program at N.Y.C.C.C. that you have employed, not including those currently employed?
14 _____ graduates
6. How many graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. have been superior to the average entry level employee?
16 1. None 2. Very few 3. Some 4. Most 5. All
7. How many graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. have been inferior to the average entry level employee?
17 1. None 2. Very few 3. Some 4. Most 5. All
8. How much orientation and/or in-service training do you expect to provide the average new employee?
18 _____ number of hours
9. How much orientation and/or in-service training is required for a typical N.Y.C.C.C. graduate of the above program?
21 _____ number of hours
10. Do you expect to employ future graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. if you hire specialists in the future?
24 1. Yes 2. No
11. Please indicate where your hiring emphasis will be for the next five years.
25 1. Associate degree level 2. Baccalaureate degree level 3. No emphasis
4. Can't forecast 5. Don't plan to hire 6. Other _____

12. On the chart below, please rate the Initial Entry Characteristics of most of the N. Y. C. C. C. graduates in your employ, in each area specified.

	Excellent	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Acceptable	Doesn't Apply
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							
35							
36							
37							
38							
39							
40							
41							
42							
43							
44							
45							
46							

13. If you have terminated the employment of a NYCCC graduate for unsatisfactory performance, circle the reasons:

- 47 1. Technical competence 2. Technical knowledge 3. Theoretical knowledge 4. Manipulative skills
- 51 5. Communication skills, oral 6. Communication skills, written 7. Adatability 8. Responsibility
- 55 9. Reliability 10. Punctuality 11. Peer relationships 12. Supervisor Relationships 13. Initiative
- 60 14. Client/patient relationships 15. Cooperation 16. Enthusiasm 17. Organizational loyalty
- 64 18. Personal appearance 19. Other (please specify) _____

14. Have you had opportunities to make your employment needs known to the appropriate departments at N. Y. C. C. C.?

- 66 1. Yes 2. No

15. If the means were available, would you make your needs and opinions known to N.Y.C.C.C. on a regular basis?

- 67 1. Yes 2. No

16. Please tell us how we may better prepare our graduates for employment in your organization. Please be specific.



New York City Community College

OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, 300 JAY STREET, BROOKLYN, N.Y. 11201

ALLIED
HEALTH
DEPARTMENT
SURVEY

EMPLOYER EVALUATION

DENTAL HYGIENE DEPARTMENT

Please consider graduates of the above referenced program ONLY when responding.

Please CIRCLE the number of the response that is your current answer to each multiple choice question. If the question requires a write-in answer, please PRINT your response.

1. Organization name _____
Your name _____
Address _____
2. Do you have any graduates of the above program of New York City Community College (N.Y.C.C.C.) in your employ at this time?
1. Yes 2. No
3. How many graduates of the above program of New York City Community College are you currently employing?
_____ graduates
4. Have you employed any graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. in the past?
1. Yes 2. No
5. What is the total number of graduates of the above program at N.Y.C.C.C. that you have employed, not including those currently employed?
_____ graduates
6. How many graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. have been superior to the average entry level employee?
1. None 2. **Very few** 3. Some 4. Most 5. All
7. How many graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. have been inferior to the average entry level employee?
1. None 2. **Very few** 3. Some 4. Most 5. All
8. How much orientation and/or in-service training do you expect to provide the average new employee?
_____ number of hours
9. How much orientation **and/or** in-service training is required for a typical N.Y.C.C.C. graduate of the above program?
_____ number of hours
10. Do you expect to employ future graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. if you hire specialists in the future?
1. Yes 2. No
11. Please indicate where your hiring emphasis will be for the next five years.
1. Associate degree level 2. Baccalaureate degree level 3. No emphasis
4. Can't forecast 5. Don't plan to hire 6. Other _____

12. On the chart below, please rate the Initial Entry Characteristics of most of the N. Y. C. C. C. graduates in your employ, in each area specified.

Excellent Very good Good Fair Poor Not Acceptable Doesn't Apply

	Excellent	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Acceptable	Doesn't Apply
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							
35							
36							
37							
38							
39							
40							
41							
42							
43							
44							
45							
46							

13. If you have terminated the employment of a NYCCC graduate for unsatisfactory performance, circle the reasons:

- 47 1. Technical competence 2. Technical knowledge 3. Theoretical knowledge 4. Manipulative skills
- 51 5. Communication skills, oral 6. Communication skills, written 7. Adatibility 8. Responsibility
- 55 9. Reliability 10. Punctuality 11. Peer relationships 12. Supervisor Relationships 13. Initiative
- 60 14. Client/patient relationships 15. Cooperation 16. Enthusiasm 17. Organizational loyalty
- 64 18. Personal appearance 19. Other (please specify) _____

14. Have you had opportunities to make your employment needs known to the appropriate departments at N. Y. C. C. C.?

- 66 1. Yes 2. No

15. If the means were available, would you make your needs and opinions known to N.Y.C.C.C. on a regular basis?

- 67 1. Yes 2. No

16. Please tell us how we may better prepare our graduates for employment in your organization. Please be specific.



New York City Community College

OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, 300 JAY STREET, BROOKLYN, N.Y. 11201

ALLIED
HEALTH
DEPARTMENT
SURVEY

EMPLOYER EVALUATION

CHEMICAL TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT

Please consider graduates of the above referenced program ONLY when responding.

Please CIRCLE the number of the response that is your current answer to each multiple choice question. If the question requires a write-in answer, please PRINT your response.

1. Organization name _____
Your name _____
Address _____
2. Do you have any graduates of the above program of New York City Community College (N.Y.C.C.C.) in your employ at this time?
1. Yes 2. No
3. How many graduates of the above program of New York City Community College are you currently employing?
_____ graduates
4. Have you employed any graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. in the past?
1. Yes 2. No
5. What is the total number of graduates of the above program at N.Y.C.C.C. that you have employed, not including those currently employed?
_____ graduates
6. How many graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. have been superior to the average entry level employee?
1. None 2. Very few 3. Some 4. Most 5. All
7. How many graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. have been inferior to the average entry level employee?
1. None 2. Very few 3. Some 4. Most 5. All
8. How much orientation and/or in-service training do you expect to provide the average new employee?
_____ number of hours
9. How much orientation and/or in-service training is required for a typical N.Y.C.C.C. graduate of the above program?
_____ number of hours
10. Do you expect to employ future graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. if you hire specialists in the future?
1. Yes 2. No
11. Please indicate where your hiring emphasis will be for the next five years.
1. Associate degree level 2. Baccalaureate degree level 3. No emphasis
4. Can't forecast 5. Don't plan to hire 6. Other _____

12. On the chart below, please rate the Initial Entry Characteristics of most of the N. Y. C. C. C. graduates in your employ, in each area specified.

Excellent Very good Good Fair Poor Not Acceptable Doesn't Apply

	Excellent	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Acceptable	Doesn't Apply
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							
35							
36							
37							
38							
39							
40							
41							
42							
43							
44							
45							
46							

13. If you have terminated the employment of a NYCCC graduate for unsatisfactory performance, circle the reasons:

- 47 1. Technical competence 2. Technical knowledge 3. Theoretical knowledge 4. Manipulative skills
- 51 5. Communication skills, oral 6. Communication skills, written 7. Adatability 8. Responsibility
- 55 9. Reliability 10. Punctuality 11. Peer relationships 12. Supervisor Relationships 13. Initiative
- 60 14. Client/patient relationships 15. Cooperation 16. Enthusiasm 17. Organizational loyalty
- 64 18. Personal appearance 19. Other (please specify) _____

14. Have you had opportunities to make your employment needs known to the appropriate departments at N. Y. C. C. C.?

- 66 1. Yes 2. No

15. If the means were available, would you make your needs and opinions known to N.Y.C.C.C. on a regular basis?

- 67 1. Yes 2. No

16. Please tell us how we may better prepare our graduates for employment in your organization. Please be specific.



New York City Community College

OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, 300 JAY STREET, BROOKLYN, N.Y. 11201

ALLIED
HEALTH
DEPARTMENT
SURVEY

EMPLOYER EVALUATION

NURSING DEPARTMENT

Please consider graduates of the above referenced program ONLY when responding.

Please CIRCLE the number of the response that is your current answer to each multiple choice question. If the question requires a write-in answer, please PRINT your response.

1. Organization name _____
Your name _____
Address _____
2. Do you have any graduates of the above program of New York City Community College (N.Y.C.C.C.) in your employ at this time?
1. Yes 2. No
3. How many graduates of the above program of New York City Community College are you currently employing?
_____ graduates
4. Have you employed any graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. in the past?
1. Yes 2. No
5. What is the total number of graduates of the above program at N.Y.C.C.C. that you have employed, not including those currently employed?
_____ graduates
6. How many graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. have been superior to the average entry level employee?
1. None 2. Very few 3. Some 4. Most 5. All
7. How many graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. have been inferior to the average entry level employee?
1. None 2. Very few 3. Some 4. Most 5. All
8. How much orientation and/or in-service training do you expect to provide the average new employee?
_____ number of hours
9. How much orientation and/or in-service training is required for a typical N.Y.C.C.C. graduate of the above program?
_____ number of hours
10. Do you expect to employ future graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. if you hire specialists in the future?
1. Yes 2. No
11. Please indicate where your hiring emphasis will be for the next five years.
1. Associate degree level 2. Baccalaureate degree level 3. No emphasis
4. Can't forecast 5. Don't plan to hire 6. Other _____

12. On the chart below, please rate the Initial Entry Characteristics of most of the N. Y. C. C. C. graduates in your employ, in each area specified.

	Excellent	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Acceptable	Doesn't Apply
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							
35							
36							
37							
38							
39							
40							
41							
42							
43							
44							
45							
46							

13. If you have terminated the employment of a NYCCC graduate for unsatisfactory performance, circle the reasons:

- 47 1. Technical competence 2. Technical knowledge 3. Theoretical knowledge 4. Manipulative skills
 51 5. Communication skills, oral 6. Communication skills, written 7. Adatability 8. Responsibility
 55 9. Reliability 10. Punctuality 11. Peer relationships 12. Supervisor Relationships 13. Initiative
 60 14. Client/patient relationships 15. Cooperation 16. Enthusiasm 17. Organizational loyalty
 64 18. Personal appearance 19. Other (please specify) _____

14. Have you had opportunities to make your employment needs known to the appropriate departments at N. Y. C. C. C.?

- 66 1. Yes 2. No

15. If the means were available, would you make your needs and opinions known to N.Y.C.C.C. on a regular basis?

- 67 1. Yes 2. No

16. Please tell us how we may better prepare our graduates for employment in your organization. Please be specific.



New York City Community College

OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, 300 JAY STREET, BROOKLYN, N.Y. 11201

ALLIED
HEALTH
DEPARTMENT
SURVEY

EMPLOYER EVALUATION

OPHTHALMIC DISPENSING DEPARTMENT

Please consider graduates of the above referenced program ONLY when responding.

Please CIRCLE the number of the response that is your current answer to each multiple choice question. If the question requires a write-in answer, please PRINT your response.

1. Organization name _____
Your name _____
5 Address _____
2. Do you have any graduates of the above program of New York City Community College (N.Y.C.C.C.) in your employ at this time?
10 1. Yes 2. No
3. How many graduates of the above program of New York City Community College are you currently employing?
11 _____ graduates
4. Have you employed any graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. in the past?
13 1. Yes 2. No
5. What is the total number of graduates of the above program at N.Y.C.C.C. that you have employed, not including those currently employed?
14 _____ graduates
6. How many graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. have been superior to the average entry level employee?
16 1. None 2. Very few 3. Some 4. Most 5. All
7. How many graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. have been inferior to the average entry level employee?
17 1. None 2. Very few 3. Some 4. Most 5. All
8. How much orientation and/or in-service training do you expect to provide the average new employee?
18 _____ number of hours
9. How much orientation and/or in-service training is required for a typical N.Y.C.C.C. graduate of the above program?
21 _____ number of hours
10. Do you expect to employ future graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. if you hire specialists in the future?
24 1. Yes 2. No
11. Please indicate where your hiring emphasis will be for the next five years.
5 1. Associate degree level 2. Baccalaureate degree level 3. No emphasis
4. Can't forecast 5. Don't plan to hire 6. Other _____

12. On the chart below, please rate the Initial Entry Characteristics of most of the N. Y. C. C. C. graduates in your employ, in each area specified.

Excellent Very good Good Fair Poor Not Acceptable Doesn't Apply

	Excellent	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Acceptable	Doesn't Apply
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							
35							
36							
37							
38							
39							
40							
41							
42							
43							
44							
45							
46							

13. If you have terminated the employment of a NYCCC graduate for unsatisfactory performance, circle the reasons:

- 47 1. Technical competence 2. Technical knowledge 3. Theoretical knowledge 4. Manipulative skills
 51 5. Communication skills, oral 6. Communication skills, written 7. Adatability 8. Responsibility
 55 9. Reliability 10. Punctuality 11. Peer relationships 12. Supervisor Relationships 13. Initiative
 60 14. Client/patient relationships 15. Cooperation 16. Enthusiasm 17. Organizational loyalty
 64 18. Personal appearance 19. Other (please specify) _____

14. Have you had opportunities to make your employment needs known to the appropriate departments at N. Y. C. C. C.?

- 66 1. Yes 2. No

15. If the means were available, would you make your needs and opinions known to N.Y.C.C.C. on a regular basis?

- 67 1. Yes 2. No

16. Please tell us how we may better prepare our graduates for employment in your organization. Please be specific.



New York City Community College

OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, 300 JAY STREET, BROOKLYN, N.Y. 11201

ALLIED
HEALTH
DEPARTMENT
SURVEY

EMPLOYER EVALUATION

RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT

Please consider graduates of the above referenced program ONLY when responding.

Please CIRCLE the number of the response that is your current answer to each multiple choice question. If the question requires a write-in answer, please PRINT your response.

1. Organization name _____
Your name _____
Address _____
2. Do you have any graduates of the above program of New York City Community College (N.Y.C.C.C.) in your employ at this time?
1. Yes 2. No
3. How many graduates of the above program of New York City Community College are you currently employing?
_____ graduates
4. Have you employed any graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. in the past?
1. Yes 2. No
5. What is the total number of graduates of the above program at N.Y.C.C.C. that you have employed, not including those currently employed?
_____ graduates
6. How many graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. have been superior to the average entry level employee?
1. None 2. Very few 3. Some 4. Most 5. All
7. How many graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. have been inferior to the average entry level employee?
1. None 2. Very few 3. Some 4. Most 5. All
8. How much orientation and/or in-service training do you expect to provide the average new employee?
_____ number of hours
9. How much orientation and/or in-service training is required for a typical N.Y.C.C.C. graduate of the above program?
_____ number of hours
10. Do you expect to employ future graduates of the above program of N.Y.C.C.C. if you hire specialists in the future?
1. Yes 2. No
11. Please indicate where your hiring emphasis will be for the next five years.
1. Associate degree level 2. Baccalaureate degree level 3. No emphasis
4. Can't forecast 5. Don't plan to hire 6. Other _____

12. On the chart below, please rate the Initial Entry Characteristics of most of the N. Y. C. C. C. graduates in your employ, in each area specified.

	Excellent	Very good	Good	Fair	Poor	Not Acceptable	Doesn't Apply
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
32							
33							
34							
35							
36							
37							
38							
39							
40							
41							
42							
43							
44							
45							
46							

13. If you have terminated the employment of a NYCCC graduate for unsatisfactory performance, circle the reasons:

- 47 1. Technical competence 2. Technical knowledge 3. Theoretical knowledge 4. Manipulative skills
 51 5. Communication skills, oral 6. Communication skills, written 7. Adatability 8. Responsibility
 55 9. Reliability 10. Punctuality 11. Peer relationships 12. Supervisor Relationships 13. Initiative
 60 14. Client/patient relationships 15. Cooperation 16. Enthusiasm 17. Organizational loyalty
 64 18. Personal appearance 19. Other (please specify) _____

14. Have you had opportunities to make your employment needs known to the appropriate departments at N. Y. C. C. C.?

- 66 1. Yes 2. No

15. If the means were available, would you make your needs and opinions known to N.Y.C.C.C. on a regular basis?

- 67 1. Yes 2. No

16. Please tell us how we may better prepare our graduates for employment in your organization. Please be specific.

**Allied Health Learning Center Evaluation
Student Questionnaire**



New York City Community College

OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, 300 JAY STREET, BROOKLYN, N.Y. 11201

ALLIED HEALTH PROGRAM SURVEY Allied Health Learning Center Student Questionnaire

Please CIRCLE the number of the response that is your current answer to each multiple choice question. If the question requires a write-in answer, please PRINT your response.

1. What is your program?

1. Chemical Technology 2. Dental Hygiene 3. Dental Laboratory 4. Medical Lab.
5. Nursing 6. Ophthalmic Dispensing 7. Radiologic Technology

2. What is your predominant attendance category?

1. Full time/Day 2. Part time/Day 3. Full time/Evening 4. Part time/Evening

3. What is your enrollment pattern?

1. Continuous 2. Non-continuous

4. What is your expected year of graduation?

1. 1975 2. 1976 3. 1977 4. 1978 5. Other (specify) _____

5. What year did you start New York City Community College (N.Y.C.C.C.)?

1. 1971 2. 1972 3. 1973 4. 1974 5. 1975 6. Other (specify) _____

6. Did you transfer into N.Y.C.C.C. Allied Health program from another program at N.Y.C.C.C. or another college and how many credits did you transfer?

0. Did not transfer in 1. Number of credits transferred: _____

7. If you transferred into N.Y.C.C.C., from what college and/or what program did you transfer?

- College _____ / Program _____

8. What is your present age?

1. Below 19 2. 19-20 3. 21-23 4. 24-26 5. 27-29 6. 30-35 7. 35-40
8. Over 40

9. What was your experience in the Health Field before your enrollment in N. Y. C. C. C.?
- 11 0. None 1. Aide 2. Licensed Practical Nurse 3. Technician 4. Corpsman (military)
5. Orderly 6. Transfer from Associate Program 7. Transfer from BS pgm 8. Other
10. On the average, how many hours per week have you been employed for a salary while you have been a student at N. Y. C. C. C.?
- 12 0. 0 hours 1. 1-10 hours 2. 11-20 hours 3. 21-30 hours 4. 31-40 hours 5 over 40 hrs
11. Have any of your instructors ever explained the services available to you at Allied Health Learning Center (called AHLC in this questionnaire)?
- 13 1. Yes 2. No.
12. Have any of your instructors ever recommended the services of AHLC to you?
- 14 1. Yes 2. No.
13. Have any of your Student Personnel Services Counselors ever explained the services available to you at AHLC?
- 15 1. Yes 2. No.
14. Have any of your Student Personnel Services Counselors ever recommended the services of AHLC to you?
- 16 1. Yes 2. No.
15. Have any of your Departmental Academic Advisors ever explained the services available to you at AHLC?
- 17 1. Yes 2. No.
16. Have any of your Departmental Academic Advisors ever recommended the services of AHLC to you?
- 18 1. Yes 2. No
17. Have you attended the FRESHMAN LEARNING SKILLS/PROFESSIONAL LEARNING SYSTEMS course (for Allied Health students in Pearl 503)?
- 19 1. Yes. 2. No.
18. If your answer to #17 was Yes, please complete the following by checking the boxes:

The Freshman Learning Skills/Professional Learning Systems course:		Yes 1	Sometimes 2	No 3
20	Provides a necessary service			
21	Helped improve your reading skill			
22	Helped improve your study skills			
23	Helped increase your biostatistic understanding			
24	Helped increase your confidence in your overall ability			

19. Have you attended the EFFECTIVE READING PROGRAM using the reading accelerator?

1. Yes 2. No.

IF your answer to question #19 was Yes, please answer questions 20 thru 22.

20. How many times did you attend? _____

21. How many passages did you read? _____

22. Please complete the following chart by checking the appropriate boxes:

The Effective Reading Program:	Yes 1	Sometimes 2	No. 3
Provides a necessary service			
Helped improve your reading rate			
Helped improve your reading comprehension			
Helped increase your confidence in your overall ability			

23. Have you attended the OPEN LAB in Pearl 506 for assistance in Allied Health courses?

1. Yes 2. No.

IF your answer to question 23 was Yes, please answer questions 24 thru 29.

24. What type of assistance did you obtain?

Student assistance 1. Yes 2. No

Graduate of faculty assistance 1. Yes 2. No.

Individual use of materials 1. Yes 2. No.

25. Please evaluate the assistance by checking the boxes in the chart below:

	Yes 1	Sometimes 2	No 3
Was the assistance helpful?			
Was the assistance sufficient?			
Did you request the use of Study Guides?			
Were the study guides helpful?			
Did you use materials in the AHLC?			
Were the materials helpful?			

26. Have you attended Certification Seminars?

1. Yes 2. No.

27. How many Certification Seminar sessions did you attend? _____

IF you did attend Certification Seminars, please answer questions 28 & 29.

28. Did the Certification Seminars help to increase your knowledge in the subject areas they covered?

47 1. Yes 2. No.

29. Did the Certification Seminars help to increase your confidence in your ability to pass the Certification Exam?

48 1. Yes 2. No.

30. Do you plan to attend Certification Seminars in the future?

49 1. Yes 2. No.

31. Has the Allied Health Learning Center been responsive to your needs?

50 1. Yes 2. Sometimes 3. No.

Please explain your answer. _____

32. How helpful do you believe the Allied Health Learning Center is?

51 1. Extremely helpful 2. Very helpful 3. Somewhat helpful
4. Not very helpful 5. Useless

Please explain your answer. _____

33. What additional services can the Allied Health Learning Center provide to students at N. Y. C. C. C.? Please be specific.

**Allied Health Learning Center Evaluation
Faculty Questionnaire**



New York City Community College

OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, 300 JAY STREET, BROOKLYN, N.Y. 11201

Allied Health Learning Center

Faculty Questionnaire

ALLIED HEALTH PROGRAM SURVEY

Please CIRCLE the number of the response that is your current answer to each multiple choice question. If the question requires a write-in answer, please PRINT your response.

1. What is your position?

1. Faculty, full time 2. Faculty, part time, day 3. Faculty, part time, evening
 4. Faculty, adjunct 5. Department Chairperson 6. Other _____

2. What is your rank?

1. Professor 2. Associate Prof. 3. Assistant Prof. 4. Lecturer 5. Instructor 6. Other _____

3. What is your length of service at New York City Community College (N. Y. C. C. C.)?

_____ years

4. What is your teaching experience prior to coming to N. Y. C. C. C.?

_____ years

5. What department are you in?

1. Chemical Tech. 2. Dental Hygiene 3. Dental Lab 4. Medical Lab 5. Nursing
 6. Ophthalmic Dispensing 7. Radiologic Tech 8. Other _____

6. Are you tenured?

1. Yes 2. No

7. What courses do you teach during the academic year,

8. Have you used, or recommended that your students use the services of the Allied Health Learning Center (AHLC) in any of the following five major service categories?

	Yes	No
	1	2
21 A. Preparation of Instructional Aids		
22 B. Student Service, including certification seminars, freshman learning skills program, effective reading pgm., open learning lab, peer and adjunct assistance		
23 C. Student Record Services (record review, computerized student reporting)		
24 D. Use of audio/visual equipment		
25 E. Faculty Workshops		

IF you have used AHLC services for the preparation of INSTRUCTIONAL AIDS, please answer questions 9 thru 12

9. Please indicate your assesment of AHLC Instructional Aids preparation by checking the boxes in the chart below.

	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never	Not Applicable
	1	2	3	4	5
26 Assistance in the development of materials was provided					
27 Materials were produced correctly					
28 Materials produced were effective					
29 Materials arrived on time					
30 Reproduction and distribution of materials was satisfactory					
'Red tape' was excessive					

10. Did the Instructional Aid services provided by AHLC allow you to use materials that would otherwise have been unavailable to you?

- 32 1. Yes 2. Sometimes 3. No

11. Do you believe your students learning was increased by your use of Instructional Aids prepared by AHLC?

- 33 1. Yes 2. Sometimes 3. No

Please explain _____

12. How can the production of Instructional Aids by AHLC be improved? Please be specific.

IF you have recommended that your students use the AHLC STUDENT SERVICES, please answer questions 13 thru 16

13. Please indicate your assesment of components of AHLC Student Services by checking the boxes in the chart below.

Component	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never	Not Applicable
	1	2	3	4	5
CERTIFICATION SEMINARS					
34 A. Provide necessary service					
35 B. Increase student knowledge					
36 C. Increase certification passing probability					
37 D. Increase student confidence					
FRESHMAN LEARNING SKILLS PROGRAM (Professional Learning Systems)					
38 A. Provide necessary service					
39 B. Increase student reading and study skills					
40 C. Increase certification/licensure passing probability					
EFFECTIVE READING PROGRAM					
41 A. Provides necessary service					
42 B. Increases student reading rate and comprehension					
43 C. Increases student confidence					
OPEN LEARNING LAB (Student assistance, faculty & graduate instruction, instructional modules)					
44 A. Provides necessary service					
45 B. Increases student knowledge					
46 C. Increases student confidence					

14. Do you believe the Student Services of AHLC should be expanded?

1. Yes 2. No.

15. If your answer to question #14 was Yes, please provide your suggestions for expansion.

16. In what other ways can Student Services of AHLC be improved? Please be specific.

IF you have used the STUDENT RECORD SERVICES of AHLC please answer questions 17 thru 19.

17. Please indicate your assesment of AHLC Student Record Services by checking the boxes in the chart below.

	Always 1	Usually 2	Sometimes 3	Never 4	Not Applicable 5
48 Student Data/Record Review Schedules have been: Prompt					
49 Helpful					
50 In usable format					
51 In sufficient detail					

18. Did the Student Record Services provided by AHLC facilitate your efforts in student placement?

52 1. Yes 2. Sometimes 3. No.

19. How can Student Record Services provided by AHLC be improved? Please be specific.

IF you have used AHLC services for AUDIO/VISUAL EQUIPMENT, please answer questions 20 thru 23.

20. Please indicate your assesment of AHLC Equipment Services by checking the boxes in the chart below.

	Always 1	Usually 2	Sometimes 3	Never 4	Not Applicable 5
53 Equipment available as scheduled					
54 Equipment in good condition					

21. Did the services provided by AHLC allow you to use more audio/visual equipment than you would have without the existence of these services?

55 1. Yes 2. Sometimes 3. No.

22. Do you believe your students learning was increased by your use of audio/visual equipment from AHLC?

56 1. Yes 2. Sometimes 3. No.

23. How can the audio/visual equipment services of AHLC be improved? Please be specific.

IF you have participated in any FACULTY WORKSHOPS sponsored by AHLC please answer questions 24 & 25

24. How can AHLC Faculty Workshops be improved and what additional topics can you recommend?

25. Please check the box that indicates your opinion of AHLC Faculty Workshops you have attended.

	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Useless	No Opinion
	1	2	3	4
57 Writing instructional objectives				
58 Design and preparation of instructional materials				
59 Design and production of modular instruction				
60 Division of Allied Health faculty orientation				
61 Determination of readability of curriculum textbook				
62 Systems approach to instruction				
63 Techniques for valid evaluation of student performance				
64 Other				

26. In your opinion, which method is most effective to inform students of available services of AHLC?

65 1. Handouts 2. Classroom announcements 3. Posters 4. Classroom orientation by AHLC representatives

27. Do you advise students with academic problems to use AHLC Student Services?

66 1. Yes 2. No.

28. Have you participated in the development of modular instruction for use in:

67 Classroom 1. Yes 2. No.

68 Independent study in AHLC 1. Yes 2. No.

29. If you answered Yes to question #28, please rate modular instruction in the chart below.

Modular instruction was:	Always ₁	Usually ₂	Sometimes ₃	Never ₄	Don't Know ₅
69 Helpful					
70 In useable format					
71 Available for student use					

30. How can the development of modules to support instruction be expanded and improved?

31. How many times do you have professional contact with personnel of AHLC per semester?

72 0. None 1. one - three 2. four - six 3. six - eight 4. nine - eleven 5. twelve or more

32. Overall, how valuable is AHLC to students and faculty of N. Y. C. C. C.?

73 1. Extremely valuable 2. Very Valuable 3. Somewhat valuable 4. Not valuable 5. Valueless

33. Have you been made aware of the full range of services offered by AHLC?

74 1. Yes 2. No.

34. To what degree are you aware of the full range of services offered by AHLC?

75 1. Completely aware 2. Somewhat aware 3. Little awareness 4. No knowledge

35. What additional services can AHLC provide to assist you and/or increase your students knowledge? Be specific.

36. What role do you think AHLC should play in the future of the Allied Health Division? Please be specific.
