UCC Program Review Committee summary of review

Program – Medical Assisting Technology (RHE Lancaster)

This program includes the following degrees, minors, and certificates:

- A.A.S. Medical Assisting Technology

Recommendation

The program review in 2013 found the program to be viable but recommended a follow up review in AY 2016. The main concerns from the previous review were:

1. the imminent retirement of both faculty with no identified plan for replacement;
2. the method of establishing the pass rate percentage on the CMA examination affecting the CMA pass rate;
3. the teaching load which also included administrative tasks;
4. the number of students in the program.

This program is now found to be viable and the concerns have been addressed.

Date of last review – AY 2013

Date of this review – AY 2016

This review has been sent to program director and the program college dean. The dean’s response is attached.
The program review in 2013 found the program to be viable but recommended a follow up review in 2015-2016. The main concerns from the previous review were:

1. the imminent retirement of both faculty with no identified plan for replacement;
2. the method of establishing the pass rate percentage on the CMA examination affecting the CMA pass rate;
3. the teaching load which also included administrative tasks;
4. the number of students in the program.

I. Faculty

To date, there are 5 faculty members: 1 Group II (100 percent), 1 Group I early retired, and 3 Group III faculty members. The Group II faculty member started in August 2014 as program director. She has 15 years of experience and has the necessary credentials to head the program. The Group I faculty member was the previous program director, therefore allowing for program continuity.

II. CMA Accreditation

The new 2015 accreditation rules for credentialing require that 30% of the students take the exam and 60% of the students who take the exam must pass. This requirement has been reduced from a requirement that 100% of the students must take and pass the exam.

The main issue with this requirement is that students balk at the $125 fee and they are told by future employers that the exam is not required for employment. The director is working on ways to increase participation. For example, credit is given in the course being taken the semester the exam is given.

III. Teaching load

At the time of the 2013 program review, there were one full-time and one-part time faculty for the program. There are now three Group III faculty and one Group I early retired faculty in addition to the Group II faculty alleviating the concern about the heavy load for the program director.

IV. Enrollment

There are currently 44 students in the program. Enrollment has increased since the review took place in 2013 and has the potential to grow further. The main barrier
to enrollment growth is the size of the labs, which are limited to 12 students. The program does not appear to compete with the nursing program and attracts non-traditional students who wish to obtain an Associates degree in the medical field along with students who no longer wish to pursue the nursing track.

Conclusion: The program appears to be viable and the concerns regarding faculty replacement have been addressed.

Review prepared by Pramod Kanwar (Mathematics) and Lauren McMills (Chemistry and Biochemistry). Site visit conducted on November 10, 2015.
MEMORANDUM

December 21, 2015

To:       David C. Ingram, Chair, UCC Program Review Committee

From:     James M. Smith, Dean, Lancaster Campus

Copy:     William Willan, Executive Dean, Regional Higher Education

Subj:     Medical Assisting Technology Academic Program Review

I was pleased to read the results of a follow-up campus visit on the AAS in Medical Assisting Technology (MAT) program. At the point of the initial program review in 2013, the MAT program was encountering serious changes as the result of retiring program faculty and a new, very high, expectation from the program accrediting board. These concerns were in addition to a period of concern about declining program enrollments.

The search for a new faculty member that followed the 2013 review did result in a highly qualified hire that has significant years of experience in directing programs and in national service to the profession. We retained all previous Group III faculty and also benefitted from the utilization of our Group I retiree. Additionally, the new program director teaches only in the Medical Assisting Technology program, whereas the previous program director’s load was comprised of Medical Assisting Technology and Office Technology courses. Now, the program staffing levels exceed those existing in 2013. Enrollments have shifted upward and the program is now the fourth largest in Lancaster’s associate degree portfolio. The program director feels that the balance between administrative tasks and teaching is reasonable given the availability of adjunct faculty.

The accrediting body changed a requirement that 100% of students must take and pass the credentialing exam which was problematic in a state like Ohio where the exam is not required for employment. The new standard that 30% must take the exam is more realistic but will still require encouragement for students to personally pay for this professional credential if they do not foresee leaving the state for employment.

I feel that Drs. Kanwar and McMills conducted an organized and professional review of the prior report’s findings and accurately described the current situation where the program is viable, issues have been addressed, and potential exists to grow the program further.

If I can be of any assistance in the final steps of closing out this review, please contact me.