A STUDY OF COGNITIVE AND NON-COGNITIVE SELECTION CRITERIA

FOR STUDENTS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS

by

PAUL WILLIAM BOBER

Bachelor of Science Dominican College Racine, Wisconsin 1973

Master of Science Pittsburg State University Pittsburg, Kansas 1984

Education Specialist Pittsburg State University Pittsburg, Kansas 1986

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College of the Oklahoma State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of DOCTOR OF EDUCATION May, 1994

A STUDY OF COGNITIVE AND NON-COGNITIVE SELECTION CRITERIA FOR STUDENTS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS

Thesis Approved:

Adviser

IMA,

of the Graduate College Dean

Fear not, I am with you; be not dismayed; I am your God. I will strengthen you, and help you, and up hold you with my right hand of justice.

Isaiah 41:10

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my sincere thanks to my dissertation advisor, Dr. Stephen G. Katsinas. His personal interest toward my success on this national study is greatly appreciated and shall always be remembered. I also wish to thank my other committee members, Dr. Adrienne Hyle, Dr. Bill Venable and Dr. Ed Harris.

A special thank you to Dr. John Usera for his statistical expertise. His support and encouragement shall be remembered and deeply appreciated. A special thank you to Angela Shaw for her expert guidance on organizing the dissertation data for the computer. Her support and encouragement shall be remembered and deeply appreciated.

A special thanks to my mother, Aldine A. Bober, and my father, Arnold William Bober, and my brothers and sisters. Finally, I wish to express a special thank you to my wife, Rictoria Leigh, my daughter, Alia Bethany Leigh, and my son, Brandon Anthony William. Without their love, dedication, expertise and unselfish giving of time, this national study would have been most difficult to complete.

iv

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I.	INTRODUCTION
	Health Care2Statement of the Problem8Purpose11Scope of the Study11Research Questions15Definition of Terms15Assumptions of the Study20Limitations of Study21Significance of Study21
II.	REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE
	Roentgenography
	States
	Standardized Tests and Radiologic Technology49Programs56Non-Cognitive Predictors56Aptitude Testing65The Registry Examination68Summary71
III.	METHODOLOGY
	Definition and Selection of Populations74Research Instrument76Research Instrument Development77Data Collection Procedure78Statistical Procedure79

Chapter

IV.	ANALYSIS (OF THE DATA	•••	• • •	•••	•	••	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	81
	Pre: Cogi	sentation of nitive and N	Data on-Cogn	 itive	 Sel	ect.	 ion	Cr	 ite	eri	a.	•	•	•	87 92
v.	FINDINGS,	CONCLUSIONS	AND REA	COMMET	UDAT	ION	S	•	•••	•	•	•	•	•	118
	Inti Cogr Conc Recc Com	roduction . hititve and l clusions ommendations nentary	Non-Cogi	nitive	· · ·	•	• •	• • •	• • • • • •	• • •	• • •	• • •	• • •	• • •	118 121 136 142 152
LITERA	IURE CITED	•••••	•••	• • •	••	•	••	•	••	•	•	•	•	•	157
APPEND	IXES	•••••	• • • •	• • •	•••	•	••	•	•••	•	•	•	•	•	168
	APPENDIX A	- ESSENTIALS	5 AND GU	JIDELI	NES	•	•••	•	••	•	•	•	•	•	169
	APPENDIX B	- ACT EXAMIN	VATION S	SITES	••	• •	•	•	•••	•	•	•	•	•	182
	APPENDIX C	- SAT EXAMIN	VATION S	SITES	••	•	•	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	197
	APPENDIX D	- SURVEY .	• • • •	••	• •	• •	•		•••	•	•	•	•	•	199
	APPENDIX E	- INTRODUCTO	ORY LETT	ER		• •	•	•	•••	•	•	•	•	•	206
	APPENDIX F	- FOLLOW-UP	LETTER	•••	••	• •	•	•	• •	•	•		•	•	208
	APPENDIX G	- ACRONYMS				• •	•	•		•	•	•	•		210
	APPENDIX H	- STATISTIC	L ANALY	SIS		• •	•	•	• •	•	•	•	•		214
	APPENDIX I	- WEIGHTING TECHNOLOGY	MECHANI (APPLIC	SM FC	RR ATA	ADIC				•	•	•	•	•	216

Page

6

LIST OF TABLES

Table	F	Page
I.	Radiologic Technology Programs In The United States: Enrollment and Graduates in 1989-90, By Institution Type, Number and Percent	23
II.	Radiologic Technology Programs Accredited by the Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation (CAHEA) In 1990, By Number and Percent	42
III.	Performance of First-Time Examinees on the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists Examination, 1991	69
IV.	First-Time Performance of Examinees on the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists March, July and October Examinations by Regions, 1991	70
v.	Gender of Respondents to the Survey of Recruitment, Admission and Selection Criteria for Radiologic Technology Programs, by Number and Percent	82
VI.	Job Classification of Respondents to the Survey of Recruitment, Admission and Selection Criteria for Radiologic Technology Programs, by Number and Percent	83
VII.	Educational Level of Respondents to the Survey of Recruitment, Admission and Selection Criteria for Radiologic Technology Programs, by Number and Percent	83
VIII.	Location of Community Colleges of Respondents to the Survey of Recruitment, Admission and Selection Criteria for Radiologic Technology Program, by Number and December	04
	Percent	84
TX.	Examination First Time Pass Rate, 1991	86
х.	Responding Radiologic Technology Program Directors' Use of Student Cognitive Selection Criteria and Weighted Instruments Currently Being Used	87
XI.	Responding Radiologic Technology Program Directors' Use of Student Non-Cognitive Selection Criteria and Weighted Instruments Currently Being Used	89

Table

XII.	Responding Radiologic Technology Program Directors' Perception Regarding Cognitive Selection Criteria Used 1990-1991, by Type of Community College	89
XIII.	Responding Radiologic Technology Program Directors' Opinions Regarding Non-Cognitive Selection Criteria Used in 1990-1991, by Type of Community College	91
XIV.	Responding Radiologic Technology Program Directors' Opinions Regarding Cognitive Student Selection Being Used Now	92
XV.	Responding Radiologic Technology Program Directors' Opinions Regarding Non-Cognitive Student Selection Criteria Being Used Now	99
XVI.	Responding Radiologic Technology Program Directors' Opinions Regarding What Cognitive Criteria Should Be Used and How Should Such Criteria Be Used	100
XVII.	Responding Radiologic Technology Program Directors' Opinions Regarding What Non-Cognitive Criteria Should Be Used and How Should Such Criteria Be Used	113

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Changes in the types and characteristics of the allied health work force in the 20th century, including the field of radiologic technology, have been dramatic. Health professions requiring a college education or professional preparation account for approximately 200,000 persons in 1900; 692,00 in 1940; 914,00 in 1960; and 4.9 million in 1990 (Kissick, 1968; U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1970; Genzberg, 1990). Employment in the allied health care industry has grown more rapidly than overall employment. In 1900, persons employed in health occupations accounted for 1.2 percent of the labor force. This proportion increased to 2.1 percent in 1940, 3.0 percent in 1960, and 7.6 percent in 1990 (Freudenheim, 1990; U.S. Department of Labor, 1990).

If President Bill Clinton's National Health Care Plan is enacted, most people predict there will be an increase in allied health professionals as the nation shifts from an acute care illness base to one based on health promotion, and preventive medicine.

With this increase, how will students in the allied health professions be selected? Who will make up the future health care worker? Within the guise of open access, open door higher education, how can allied health programs, including the field of radiologic technology, promote access and equity, existing as selective programs in non-selective institutions? This is a problem that has gained the

1

attention of community college radiologic technology program directors, practitioners and other allied health program directors for a number of years.

Health Care

The earliest evidence of healing as a profession dates back to Mesopotamia and Egypt some 5,000 years ago. At that time healing was a quasi-religious art practiced with exorcisms, incantations and prayers for treating diseases. The Chinese based their treatment of disease on the theory of Yin and Yang balance. The Greeks and Hippocrates gave the guidelines for patient-physician relationship and the ethical basis of treatment (Stanfield, 1990).

The evolution of medicine and rise of technology-based treatments set the stage for the development of health care services beginning in the mid-nineteenth century. By 1900, most infectious disease epidemics such as influenza, diphtheria and whooping cough had been brought under control, and a gradual shift of attention toward the treatment of individual illnesses occurred. Pneumonia, tuberculosis, heart disease, and nephritis as well as accidents and war victims were the major conditions requiring treatment in the first decades of this century. The arrival of antibiotics in the 1940s ended the dominance of acute infectious disease and marked the ascent of chronic illness such as heart disease, stroke and cancer. Thus, from approximately 1850 to about 1900, the scientific basis of American medical technology was very narrow and the number of treatment modalities was quite limited (Stanfield, 1990).

After 1900, technology began to advance rapidly. The great improvements brought by the application of technologies such as x-rays in 1895, and the discoveries of insulin and the Salk vaccine in the first decades of the twentieth century, coincided with a gradual shift and recognition that health care was a right and not a privilege (Stanfield, 1990). The establishment of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) in 1937 and the landmark federal hospital-construction program of 1946, commonly referred to as the Hill-Burton Act, are evidence of this movement. The National Institutes of Health (NIH) committed the federal government to the direct support of medical research and applications training, while the Hill-Burton Act required hospitals constructed with federal funds provided through the Act to serve a percentage of indigent people (Stanfield, 1990). Medicare, passed in 1965, and President Bill Clinton's 1993 universal health plan are other demonstrations of the move toward health care as a right and not a privilege.

Delivery of health care traditionally has been directed by physicians in private practice. America's health care system has been primarily financed by personal nongovernment funds, typically paid for by consumers through private health insurance. Over the years, Americans have come to expect the best medical care possible, and health care expenditures in the United States are rapidly rising. In 1986, Americans spent an average of \$1,837 per person on health care for a total of \$458 billion. This total constituted 10.9 percent of the national gross national product (GNP), an increase from 10.3 percent in 1984 and just 5.9 percent in 1965. The Health Care Financing Administration projected in 1987 that health care expenditures would total \$1.5 trillion in the year 2000, of which 33 percent would be borne

3

by the federal government, 30 percent by private insurance and 25 percent by patients (Health Care Financing Administration, 1987).

With the creation of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) in 1937, the federal government began to support large medical research projects. As the quality of antibiotics improved, medical care greatly expanded. New techniques and technology motivated practitioners in the allied health profession as the public came to expect a better standard of health care. The creation of NIH also served to augment the widespread usage of technology-based medical treatments.

The growth of allied health occupations has paralleled the rapid growth in the demand for many types of health services. The American Medical Association's Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation (CAHEA) defines health care practitioners as:

a large cluster of health care related professions and personnel whose functions are: assisting, facilitating, or complementing the work of the physician and other specialists in the health care system, and who choose to be identified as allied health personnel (CAHEA, 1987).

More than 7,000 allied health programs have been established in the United States to meet the needs of an ever-expanding health care industry (National Commission on Allied Health Education, 1980). The number of students enrolled in allied health care programs accredited as of July, 1990 was 83,573, with 33,942 graduating in the 1989-90 academic year (Allied Health Education Directory, 1991). As the decade of the 1980s began, the ratio of health care applicants to positions in health care programs had been about 2.1 to 1 in two-year college programs, and 2.6 to 1 in four-year college programs, demonstrating both the high value the society places upon having well trained health care professionals, as well as the economic status completers of health care programs are able to attain (National Commission on Allied Health Education, 1980).

Factors leading to the increased use of health care services include population growth, aging and the intensifying role of the federal government to provide better access to health care. The Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) identified more than seven million health care workers in 185 occupations in 1984, and projected that in 1995, 9.1 million workers would be employed in 200 separate health care-related occupations. The BLS estimated that between 1986 and the year 2000, the number of jobs within the field of radiologic technology will grow by 65 percent, from 115,400 to 190,100. To prepare their estimates, the BLS analysts evaluated job opportunities in the many areas radiology encompasses, including sonography, fluoroscopy, mammography, computerized tomography, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and radiation therapy. Given the gradual shift toward a wellness oriented paradigm, with emphasis on the early identification of preventable diseases and cancers, radiography by all accounts is projected to have a bright future within the family of allied health occupations (Institute of Medicine, 1989).

The future supply of allied health personnel is highly sensitive to small increments within a number of variables. These variables include adequately trained people, job availability, job location and salaries. Salary adjustments is a key variable to any strategy designed to alleviate labor market concerns. Salary increases can attract new entrants to the field, encourage the return of those who left and prolong the attachment to the field of those already in it (Institute of Medicine, 1989).

To compare trends between hospital-based and college-based

radiologic technology programs, Hansett (1992) conducted a survey in the northeastern United States (1992). The average salary range of participating institutions in Hansett's survey revealed a low salary of \$16,500 in Pennsylvania and a high of \$32,00 in New Jersey. This compared to a national average of \$27,100 as determined by a recent American Society of Radiologic Technologist (ASRT) survey (Hansett, 1992).

The most comprehensive profile measuring specifics of income, education, and the attitudes of radiologic science professionals in recent years has been the American Society of Radiologic Technologists (ASRT) annual survey. The ASRT survey in 1992 was mailed to 11,386 radiologic technologists. There were 4,692 surveys returned for a 41.2 percent response rate. One of the survey findings was that technologists believed higher education not only was equated to increased professionalism, but to increased earnings potential as well. Nationally, technologists who held an Associate Degree in Radiologic Technology earned about \$13.75 an hour (American Society of Radiologic Technologists, 1992).

How health care needs are addressed depends in part upon whether people with requisite education are available and how those skilled professionals are deployed. Consequently, comprehensive assessment of future allied health personnel needs has never been more important. Allied health care personnel will need to develop a broader understanding and competence in health care delivery. Tomorrow's health care personnel will need to develop special skills in order to deal with changing demographic, cultural and scientific/technological conditions. One critically important task is to ensure that the educational curricula for health care professionals includes courses with competency-based objectives and a programmatic relevance to these changes (Institute of Medicine, 1989).

Perhaps the most comprehensive definition of health was stated in the Charter of the World Health Organization, one of the six constituent organizations affiliated with the United Nations: "the state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity" (French, 1974, p. 1). Within this definition lies the philosophical basis for a shift toward a wellness-based health care paradigm, away from merely an acute illness care system as presently exists. The growth in the utilization of health services, the broadening of the types of services offered and technological advances have resulted in an increased demand for qualified allied health personnel. This demand for allied health services will likely be further increased by well-established socioeconomic trends that are projected as likely to continue (Williams & Torrens, 1988).

Population growth in the United States is slowing. The population increased by one percent annually between 1972 and 1986, but the Bureau of the Census projects growth of only 0.8 percent annually to the year 2000. The rate of growth will not be uniform among age, race or ethnic groups, based on moderate projections of the Bureau of the Census (Fullerton, 1987). Future health care needs will depend in part on the health and functional status of the growing elderly population. Clearly, a wide range of health services will be required to address the health care needs of our human population.

The primary purpose of allied health education is to prepare students for service in health care professions. Therefore, educational processes must be related to practical needs in the field and viewed as a means of achieving standard performance objectives. In a 1980 report, the National Commission on Allied Health Education (NCAHE) stated:

Educational institutions, with the advice and counsel of professional associates and practitioners, should evaluate student selection procedures to determine whether more reliable predictors of probable success than those presently in use can be found and utilized (NCAHE, 1980, p. 166).

With an abundance of applicants and limited enrollments, one of the most perplexing problems for allied health care educators today is student selection (Barry, 1983). It therefore follows that the selection criteria used in allied health programs such as radiologic technology should be good indicators of success (i.e., be clinically competent and pass the appropriate national certification test). However, when allied health educators meet, concerns over selection criteria for entry into these highly competitive programs are consistently voiced. Thus, the concern for reliable indicators of student success to improve the selection process of community college radiologic technology programs provides the impetus for this study.

Statement of the Problem

Student selection for community college radiologic technology programs is a significant problem because such programs have a responsibility to produce graduates with an appropriate mix of cognitive, affective, and psychomotor skills (<u>Essentials</u>, 1990). The changing nature of prospective radiologic technology student backgrounds requires that community college radiologic technology programs identify and assess these students' personal attributes in different ways. The results of a study by Blagg and Blagg (1985) have several implications for practice in the area of student selection procedures, particularly for educators in the radiologic sciences who are faced with the problem of identifying adequate selection procedures for increasing numbers of qualified applicants. First, the results suggested that evaluators must be especially sensitive to potential gender-related biases, especially in the screening phase of the selection process.

Otherwise, enrollment distributions for whites, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, other Hispanics, Asians or Pacific Islander, and American Indians or Alaskan Natives were consistent between the academic years (Allied Health Education Fact Sheet, 1992). The number of women in the labor force is projected to increase more than twice as fast as the number of men, and in the year 2000 women will constitute nearly half the labor force. The number of African-American workers will increase twice as fast, Asian workers will increase five times as fast, and Hispanic workers more than five times as fast as the number of white workers. Thus, by the year 2000, the economy will be more dependent on women workers (who have always been prominent in the allied health profession) and on minority workers (Institute of Medicine, 1989).

White students constituted the majority (79 percent) of 1990-91 enrollments in all accredited allied health programs which included radiologic technology. African-American students made up 11 percent, Hispanic students including Mexican Americans (3 percent), Puerto Ricans (1 percent) and other Hispanics (2 percent), Asians or Pacific Islanders (4 percent), and American Indians or Alaska Natives, less than one percent. Between 1989-90 and 1990-91 there was a one percent enrollment decrease for blacks in all accredited allied health programs.

The report of the National Commission on Allied Health Education stressed that educational institutions should assess their student selection procedures to identify the most reliable indicators of probable program success (National Commission on Allied Health Education, 1980). Allied health education programs should prepare students who can meet standard performance objectives and adapt to changing health services needs and technologies. These skills should be closely linked to practice requirements and standardized through role delineation studies. Therefore, to have a quality program, the maximum student enrollment in a radiologic technology program should not exceed the capacity which should be determined according to the volume and variety of radiological procedures, equipment, and personnel available for educational purposes (Essentials, 1990).

The fixed number of clinical education centers available for training radiologic technology students further compounds the issue, resulting in high rates of application rejection and low rates of applicant acceptance. Allied health educators need to be reasonably certain that their student selection policies identify candidates who have the actual and latent abilities to benefit from the program's goals and objectives (French & Rezler, 1976). Performing this selection process well, while operating as one of the most selective programs within non-selective open-access institutions, is a major challenge for the 199 community college radiologic technology program directors across the nation. All of the problems associated with increasing diversity in programs that use selective admissions are found in these programs. This, along with the fact that there has not been a national study of appropriate selection criteria to be used by community college radiologic technology programs, provides the impetus for this study.

10

The purpose of this study was to assess and analyze perceptions of community college radiologic technology program directors throughout the United States and their usage of selection criteria for prospective students through the use and analysis of the <u>Survey of Recruitment</u>, <u>Admission and Selection Criteria for Radiologic Technology Programs</u>. The 199 radiologic technology program directors were asked to fill out a survey that had as its purpose to:

- Obtain a profile of the selection criteria that are used to select radiologic technology students.
- Obtain opinions of community college radiologic technology program director's regarding the selection criteria that are being used now.
- 3. Determine what cognitive and non-cognitive selection criteria to use in selecting radiologic technology students.
- 4. Determine the importance of selection criteria used to assure applicant equity.

Scope of the Study

The scope of the study was limited to the 199 community college radiologic technology programs in the United States, as recognized by the 1990 edition of <u>The Allied Health Directory</u>. The Directory contains specific information on educational programs in 28 separate and distinct allied health occupations that range from Blood Bank Technology to Surgical Technology, as well as a description of the accreditation process used by the Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation (CAHEA), in cooperation with various discipline specific review committees. No attempt was made to examine four-year or hospital-based radiologic technology programs, which comprised 49 and 348 of the 666 total number of programs, respectively.

Because most allied health programs operate as highly selective programs at open-access, non-selective institutions, this single issue justifies the study's scope. At present, formal training in radiologic technology range from two to four years in length. These programs are varied by length and degree awarded, which can range from the granting of certificates, associate's degrees or bachelor's degrees. Two-year programs are the most common, both in terms of numbers and enrollments. Since most educational programs in the radiologic sciences have a much greater number of qualified applicants than can be accepted, the screening of applicants is a crucial step in the selection process.

Radiologic technology is considered to be a relatively young allied health profession. Therefore, the research literature available in the area of community college radiologic technology program entrance assessment, as well as student success, is limited. The category of institutions sponsoring the highest number of radiologic technology enrollments and graduates were junior and community colleges, with 53.3 percent of enrollments and 51.8 percent of graduates, respectively. Knowledge of some of the significant personality characteristics of prospective allied health professions appears to be an important variable in assessing the needed qualities to complete successfully the program of study and to function adequately in the profession (Psychological Services Bureau Bulletin, 1979, 1986, 1987). There are few instruments presently available to measure vocational adjustments, and these at best have limited application to radiologic technology programs. This limited availability of appropriate instruments likely accounts for some of the frustration expressed by radiologic technology program directors.

An individual's characteristic life style is reflected in his or her personal, educational and occupational adjustment. Knowledge of some of the significant personality characteristics of the prospective allied health professional would thus seem to be important. Feelings, attitudes and opinions frequently determine success or failure (Psychological Services Bureau Bulletin, 1986-1987).

The criteria for judging the relative success of radiologic technology programs has typically been based on the completion and passing of a written certification test which admits the graduate to the work force. The American Registry of Radiologic Technologists (ARRT) requires that candidates who plan to take its Registry Examination must have successfully completed a program of formal education which has been approved by the Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation. All applicants who have completed the eligibility requirements by the date of the examination take this 200-item objective test.

The examinations are scheduled for the third Thursday of March, July, and October at locations throughout the United States. Approximately five weeks after the examination date, the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists will mail reports of scores to all examinees. The release of the examinee's score report by the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists is governed by a policy that information about an individual shall be released only with that person's written consent. A section on the answer sheet requests the examinee to indicate whether the examinee wishes his/her score to be released to the educational program from which the examinee graduated. It is important that the examinee scores are released to programs. This allows feedback to radiologic technology educators and program directors to internally and externally evaluate whether or not students meet minimum comprehension levels within the five required subject areas: radiation protection, equipment operation and maintenance, image production and evaluation, radiographic procedures, and patient care and management. These subject test areas are related to courses that are normally taught throughout a student's training. Therefore, student score allow program officials to perform a form of quality control on their program.

Two statistical procedures are utilized in reporting scores on the Registry. The first, equating, takes into account the difficulty level of each version of the examination and the ability of each group tested. The statistical equating process is designed to identify examinees of comparable ability, regardless of the group with which the examinee is tested or the difficulty level of the examination. The second statistical procedure deals with scaled scores. Total scores for all examinees are converted to a score scale ranging from 1 to 99, with a scaled score of 75 defined as passing. A passing score does not constitute certification unless all other radiologic technology program requirements are also satisfied. These include satisfying all sponsoring institution and program curriculum requirements, including successful completion and documentation of defined objectives and competencies.

14

- What cognitive and non-cognitive selection criteria are currently being used?
- 2. What are the opinions regarding the selection criteria that are being used now?
- 3. What cognitive and non-cognitive criteria should be used, and how should such criteria be used?

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study and to assure common understanding, the significant terms were identified.

<u>Affective</u>:--The affective, or emotional, component refers to positive or negative feelings toward an issue or subject (Belkin, 1979).

<u>Allied Health Practitioners</u>:--"A large cluster of health care related professions and personnel which includes a radiologic technologists whose functions include assisting, facilitating or complementing the work of physicians and other health care specialists in the health care system, and who choose to be identified as health personnel" (Allied Health Education Directory, 1991, p. 328).

<u>Aptitude</u>:--"A level of educational preparation and achievement appropriate for the needs of the academic studies and clinical practice that will constitute each of the allied health programs" (Psychological Services Bureau Bulletin, 1979, p. 5). <u>Attitude</u>:--a relatively enduring tendency to respond consistently to an object, person, or event in either a favorable or an unfavorable way. Attitudes have three components: cognitive, affective and behavioral (Kiesler & Munson, 1979).

<u>Behavioral</u>:--The behavioral component refers to the tendency to react to the object in specific ways (Belkin, 1979).

<u>Certificate of Accreditation</u>:--"The Certificate of Accreditation is a certificate given to programs [allied health programs, including radiologic technology] on behalf of the Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation and the appropriate review committee" (Allied Health Education Directory, 1990, p. 329).

<u>Clinical Education</u> (also Directed Clinical Experience/Field Work/Practicum):--"Clinical Education is composed of (a) didactic clinical preparation, that is, units of classroom instruction in knowledge related to the professional practice content of a given vocational field and (b) supervised clinical practice, in which the student learns how to use the knowledge and practice skills taught in the didactic and clinical phases" (Allied Health Education Directory, 1991, p. 329).

<u>Cognitive</u>:--The cognitive aspect refers to our beliefs and knowledge about the object or issue (Belkin, 1979). <u>Cognitive Predictors</u>:--Predictors, as well as aptitude tests. Recall or recognition of knowledge, and the development of intellectual abilities and skills (Krathwohl, 1964).

<u>Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation (CAHEA)</u>:--"An allied health education accrediting agency sponsored by the American Medical Association" (Allied Health Education Directory, 1991, p. 329).

<u>Competency-Based Education (CBE)</u>:--"A course, program or curriculum designed on the basis of what the student is supposed to learn to do, or on demonstrable outcomes" (Allied Health Education Directory, 1991, p. 329).

<u>Credibility</u>:--Trustworthiness or credence (Random House Dictionary, 1980, p. 215).

<u>Essentials</u>:--"The minimum standards of quality used in accrediting programs that prepare individuals to enter an allied health profession" (Allied Health Education Directory, 1991, p. 331).

<u>Evaluate</u>:--"To determine the quality of an educational program by careful appraisal and study" (Allied Health Education Directory, 1991, p. 331).

<u>External Degree</u>:--"An academic award earned through one or more of the following means: prior learning, credit by examination, specially devised sponsored experimental learning programs, self-directed study or satisfactory completion of campus or off-campus courses" (Allied Health Education Directory, 1991, p. 331).

<u>Health</u>:--"The state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being; not merely the absence of disease or infirmity" (United Nations World Health Organization, as cited in French, 1976, p. 1).

<u>Hospital-Based Program</u>:--"An accredited educational program sponsored by a hospital" (Allied Health Education Directory 1991, p. 331).

Joint Review Committee (JRC):--"A generic term applicable to all review committees sponsored by two or more organizations" (Allied Health Education Directory, 1991, p. 332).

<u>Non-Cognitive Predictors</u>:--Personality characteristics and their special attributes or traits with emphasis on muscular and motor control (Dietrich, 1981).

<u>Performance Objectives</u>:--"The interim competencies achievable by students within the course of their training and the terminal competencies to be achieved by students by the end of the program" (Allied Health Education Directory, 1991, p. 333).

<u>Program Director</u>:--"The person in charge of developing and maintaining an educational program within an institution, hospital or other sponsoring agency in accordance with the qualifications and responsibilities established by the institution and delineated in the <u>Essentials</u>" (Allied Health Education Directory, 1991, p. 333).

<u>Psychomotor</u>:--The psychomotor domain emphasizes some muscular or motor control, some manipulation of material or objects, some act which requires a neuromuscular coordination (Krathwohl, 1964).

<u>Radiography</u>:--"The development of an image of a bodily part by transmitting radioactive energy (x or gamma rays) through it onto a sensitized film" (Melloni, 1993, p. 405).

<u>Registry</u>:--A published list of those who are registered in one of the three disciplines of radiologic technology, nuclear medicine technology and/or radiation therapy technology" (Allied Health Education Director, 1991, p. 334).

<u>Reliability</u>:--"The consistency with which an instrument or tool measures the same way each time it is used" (Allied Health Education Directory, 1991, p. 334).

<u>School of Allied Health</u>:--"An administrative unit with assigned responsibility for delivering several allied health educational programs" such as nursing, respiratory care and radiologic technology. Such schools may exist within a variety of institutions including but not limited to universities, colleges, community colleges, academic medical centers, and hospitals (Allied Health Education Directory, 1991, p. 334). <u>Standards</u>:--"The criteria by which programs or institutions are reviewed for accreditation purposes" (Allied Health Education Directory, 1991, p. 335).

<u>Technician</u>:--"One who specializes in the technical details of a body of work; one who has acquired the ability to perform a complex task or set of tasks" (Allied Health Education Directory, 1991, p. 335).

<u>Technologist</u>:--"One who specializes in the application of scientific knowledge to solve practical and/or theoretical problems." Knowledge and skills for performing these functions are usually achieved through a period of formal education and a period of supervised clinical practice (Allied Health Education Directory, 1991, p. 335).

<u>Validity</u>:--"The extent to which an instrument or tool measures or performs in the manner in which it was intended" (Allied Health Education Directory, 1991, p. 335).

Assumptions of the Study

- 1. It was assumed that the measuring instrument utilized was adequate for the purpose of the study.
- 2. It was assumed that the responses to the questionnaire reflected actual perceptions of the respondents toward the various facets of selection criteria used in community college radiologic technology programs.
- 3. It was assumed that respondents to this study had a significant impact on the student selection process, and that their

perceptions played a role in providing a radiologic technology student with an appropriate array of cognitive and non-cognitive traits.

4. It was assumed that because radiologic technology is considered to be a relatively young allied health profession, research literature in the area of community college radiologic technology program entrance assessment and students success outcomes would be limited.

Limitations of Study

In this study's attempt to answer research questions about selection criteria for students in community college radiologic technology programs, the following limitations were noted:

- This study was limited to the students enrolled in the 1990-91 academic year at Committee on Allied Health and Education Accreditation-accredited associate degree radiologic technology programs at community colleges in the United States.
- 2. Because of the survey structure and content, personality traits and characteristics of students noted as desirable and important for all allied health students to possess during the training period, and subsequently in the working environment, were not fully measured by program directors.

Significance of Study

The Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation (CAHEA) is an allied health education accrediting agency sponsored by the American Medical Association (AMA). Moreover, CAHEA acts as an umbrella accrediting agency in as much as it works cooperatively with externally-sponsored review committees to accredit educational programs in the numerous fields of postsecondary allied health education. In this role, CAHEA accredits most of the formal training programs in radiologic technology (Allied Health Education Directory, 1990).

There were 666 CAHEA-accredited programs in radiologic technology in 1989. The category "junior or community college" comprised 199 of the radiologic technology programs, vocational or technical schools comprised 30, and academic health centers/medical schools comprised 28 programs. The U.S. Department of Defense operated 4 of these programs. Hospitals and/or medical centers comprised 353 programs. Four-year college or university represented 47 of these programs, and the U.S. Department of Veteran Affairs operated 4 of the programs. There was one non-hospital health care facilities with a program.

Table I, "Radiologic Technology Programs in the United States: Enrollment and Degrees Awarded in 1989-90, by Institution Type, Number and Percent," describes the enrollment and degrees awarded in radiologic technology programs according to types of institution in 1989-90. According to Table I, the institutions sponsoring the highest number of enrollments and graduates in radiologic technology were programs at junior or community colleges and vocational or technical schools, as compared to four-year colleges or universities, academic health centers and medical schools, and hospitals or medical centers (Allied Health Education Directory, 1990). During the 1989-90 academic year, a total of 83,573 students were enrolled in the CAHEA-accredited programs; 33,942 of these students graduated. Fifty-three percent (44,577) of all 1989-90 enrollees were enrolled in programs sponsored by junior or community colleges (30,003) or at vocational or technical schools

(14,574).

TABLE I

RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS IN THE UNITED STATES: ENROLLMENT AND GRADUATES IN 1989-90, BY INSTITUTION TYPE, NUMBER AND PERCENT

Type of Institution		<u>lment</u> Percent	Degrees Awarded Number/Percent			
Academic Health Center/Medical School	10,255	12.3	4,441	$ \begin{array}{r} 13.1 \\ 4.4 \\ 0.3 \\ 15.1 \\ 0.0 \\ 2.5 \\ 5.3 \\ \end{array} $		
Department of Defense	2,139	2.6	1,447			
Department of Veteran Affairs	177	0.2	117			
Four-Year College or University	17,100	20.5	5,112			
Hospital or Medical Center/1-99 Beds	7	0.0	4			
Hospital or Medical Center/100-299 Beds	1,615	1.9	861			
Hospital or Medical Center/300-499 Beds	3,284	3.9	1,809			
Hospital or Medical Center/500 or more beds	4,050	4.8	2,254	6.6		
Junior or Community College	30,003	35.9	11,176	32.9		
Vocational or Technical School	14,574	17.4	6,425	18.9		
Non-Hospital Health Care Facilities or Lab	369	_0.4	266	<u>0.8</u>		
Total	83,573	100.0	33,942	100.0		

Source: Allied Health Education Directory, 1991, published by the AMA.

Within the overall family of allied health professions, junior and community colleges, together with vocational or technical schools comprised 39 percent of all institutions sponsoring CAHEA-accredited programs. Programs in medical laboratory sciences, respiratory care and the radiologic sciences comprised the majority (73 percent) of all CAHEA-accredited programs, a long standing pattern. Radiologic science programs, including radiation therapy technologists, nuclear medicine technologists and radiographers made up 31 percent (883) of the above CAHEA-accredited programs (Allied Health Education Directory, 1991).

The trends in programs, enrollments, and graduates by occupation in 1986-90 showed changes that occurred in allied health education. The number of the CAHEA-accredited programs decreased by 68 from 1986 to 1988, increased by 6 from 1988 to 1989, and increased by 24 from 1989 to 1990. Programs in the field of radiologic technology totaled 701 in 1986, with an enrollment of 15,225 and 6,400 graduates. In 1988, there were 667 radiologic technology programs, with enrollments of 15,313 students and 6,080 graduates. In 1989 there were 666 programs with 16,529 students and 6,528 graduates (Allied Health Education Directory, 1991). From 1986 to 1988 enrollments in radiologic technology programs increased by 88, while the number of graduates declined by 320. From 1988 to 1989, enrollments increased by 1,216 and graduates increased by 448. From 1989 to 1990, enrollments increased by 2,164 and graduates increased by 874, representing a consecutive increase in graduates since 1988. Female students comprised approximately 74 percent of the 1989-90 total program enrollments and graduates, a long-standing trend.

The <u>1990 Report of Program Directors' Perspectives</u> indicated that the total number of radiologic technology student applicants was 39,004. The relative number of radiologic technology student applicants who were considered by program directors to be qualified for admission into radiologic technology educational programs was 21,996 (Allied Health Education Directory, 1991). Thus, while operating institutions that profess open access, open door in their mission statements, radiologic technology programs reject one out of every two applicants.

Radiologic technology programs are generally two to four years in length, depending on program design, objectives, and the degree or certificate awarded. They require a minimum of a high school diploma or equivalent for admission. Educational background in mathematics, physics, chemistry, and biology is generally helpful. Successful completion of a radiologic technology program is dependent on documented achievements of defined objectives and competencies. The requirements

24

for a degree, usually the Associate of Applied Science degree, is generally consistent with the requirements for other degrees awarded by the sponsoring institution.

It is important to consider how specialized, highly competitive radiologic technology programs fit within the philosophic context of the universal access that lies at the heart of the community college movement in America. President Harry Truman's 1947 Commission on Higher Education strongly urged that the door to higher education be opened. The development of community colleges, with open admission policies and programs for everyone, was designed to ensure that no member of society misses a chance to acquire knowledge and expand career opportunities (Higher Education for American Democracy, 1948). With approximately 43.3 percent of all Committee on Allied Health and Education Accreditation-accredited programs sponsored by either community or junior colleges (n = 1232), the question still remains: should community colleges educate for further studies, or should they be the capstone for graded education? (Cohen, 1987)

Because the field of radiologic technology is considered to be a relatively young allied health profession, the literature related to selection criteria and student success was limited. This study will investigate the practices employed by radiologic technology programs at community colleges, specifically focusing on non-cognitive and cognitive admission predictors, in that cognitive predictors will not allow measurement of competency-based learning in the affective and psychomotor domains.

In 1944, x-ray technology, the predecessor of radiologic technology, joined the allied health professions as the fourth health occupation to establish standards of education and qualifications for accreditation. From 1944 until 1969, the American College of Radiology's Commission on Technologists Affairs, Committee on Technologist Training carried out program evaluation. In 1969, the American Society of Radiologic Technologists and the American College of Radiology established the Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology (JRCERT) within the structure for allied health education accreditation provided by the American Medical Association's Council on Medical Education. The Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology (JRCERT) was incorporated in 1971.

In 1976, the AMA's Council on Medical Education formally delegated responsibility for all allied health education accreditation to the Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation (CAHEA), which is broadly representative of allied health education interests. Accreditation of educational programs in radiography is a voluntary, peer review process that the Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology conducts with the Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation. This cooperative process is formally recognized by the United State Department of Education and the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, governmental and private agencies respectively, with oversight responsibilities for broad areas of institutional and programmatic accreditation. Over the years, the Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology has become established as one of the largest review committees within the CAHEA accreditation system.

<u>The Essentials and Guidelines of an Accredited Educational Program</u> <u>for the Radiographer</u> (commonly called <u>Essentials</u>) is the standard for the accreditation of educational programs in radiologic technology. The radiography profession was the first imaging related science to establish <u>Essentials</u>. The first radiography <u>Essentials</u> resulted from negotiations between the executive committee of the ASXT and the Council on Medical Education of the American Medical Association. The American College of Radiology and the American Registry of X-ray Technicians also collaborated on the <u>Essentials</u>.

The <u>Essentials</u> evolved from a one-page narrative to a 12-page document that include all requirements for which an accredited program is held accountable. The <u>Essentials</u> were initially adopted in 1944; reviewed in 1955, 1969, 1978, 1983 and 1990 with the collaborative efforts of the American College of Radiology, American Medical Association and the American Society of Radiologic Technologists.

The <u>Essentials</u> have evolved to include more meaningful curricula and greater professional autonomy for radiographers to establish professional standards for entry-level radiography. It is important to realize that as radiographers have assumed more responsibilities in the preparation of students, educational standards have risen (Mixdorf, 1992).

Radiologic technology programs are a vital part of the health care system and are essential to meet health care needs. In order for a radiologic technology program to continue its role as a provider of qualified health care personnel, it is important that its graduates exhibit success, measured through demonstrated clinical competencies and by passing the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists Examination. The Registry was initiated in 1922 when the Radiologic Society of North America, with the support of the American Roentgen Ray Society and the cooperation of the Canadian Association of Radiologists and the American Society of X-ray Technicians, joined in the establishment of the American Registry of Radiological Technicians. In 1962, the Registry enacted a program of examination and certification in nuclear medicine technology and radiation therapy technology. At that time, the name was changed to the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists. In 1977, the Registry adopted the term "Radiographer" to replace the previous term "X-ray Technologist".

The purpose of the Registry is to encourage the study and to elevate the standards of radiologic technology, as well as to examine and certify eligible candidates (ARRT, 1991). The purpose of this study is to assess perceptions of community college radiologic technology program directors throughout the United States and their usage of selection criteria for prospective students to help identify what selective admission criteria are being used to assess cognitive capabilities and non-cognitive traits of prospective students.

The following chapters will summarize the literature pertaining to the historical prospective of radiology: the community college as it relates to radiologic technology education, radiologic technology programs in the United States, the radiologic technology curriculum, cognitive predictors, including standardized tests and their use in radiologic technology and other allied health profession programs; non-cognitive predictors, including aptitude testing; and the Registry examination. Additional chapters will report the findings of the survey, analysis the findings, conclusions and recommendations that were developed for further studies.

28
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

The review of the literature for this chapter is divided into ten sections: (1) Historical Background of Radiologic Technology Programs, (2) Community Colleges, (3) Radiologic Technology Programs in the United States, (4) Curriculum, (5) Cognitive Predictors, (6) Standardized Tests and Radiologic Technology Programs, (7) Non-Cognitive Predictors, (8) Aptitude Testing, (9) The Registry Examination, and (10) Summary. The absence of current and appropriate information on radiologic technology selection procedures for 199 CAHEA-accredited programs based at community colleges provides impetus for this national study.

The field of radiologic technology is considered to be a relatively young Allied Health Profession. Due to limited research on community college radiologic technology entrance assessment and student success, it was decided that an investigation of selection criteria related to community college radiologic technology, including allied health, nursing and medical education, would be most relevant to this literature review.

Everywhere, men and women are beginning to realize that the education they received in the past, regardless of how little or how much, cannot sustain them for long in a time of rapid change. They are discovering that if they wish to remain in touch with the reality of an everchanging, ever-new present, they must change themselves-the only way to survive in a world where so much is new everyday, is to develop a process of continual self-renewal (Harlacher, 1978, p. 1). The overall importance of the two-year college to the American democratic ideal through providing access to postsecondary education to the general population has been the normal consensus in the literature. This importance has been debated in light of the perceived shift in two-year college curricular orientation from collegiate/transfer to vocational/technical (Baser, 1991).

Demographic studies show that the proportion of the United States population ages 18 to 23 years old will decline through the mid-1990s. Experts have predicted that this shrinkage of the so-called traditional college-age population will make it increasingly difficult for allied health programs, including radiologic technology programs, to attract qualified applicants (Institute of Medicine, 1989). The 1990 Report of Program Directors' Perspectives indicated that the total number of radiologic technology student applicants was 39,004. The relative number of radiologic technology student applicants who were considered by program directors to be qualified for admission into radiologic technology educational programs was 21,996 (Allied Health Education Directory, 1991). Thus, while operating within institutions that profess open access, open door in their mission statements, radiologic technology programs reject one out of every two applicants.

Roentgenography

Professor Wilhelm Konrad Roentgen discovered x-rays on November 8, 1895, at the University of Wurzburg, Germany (Selman, 1985). For this discovery he was awarded the Nobel Prize for Physics in 1901. As the word of the "new rays" spread throughout the world, people who possessed Crooks Tubes, essential for generating of the invisible x-rays, started examining human beings. The usefulness of x-rays in the diagnosis of human ailments soon became well recognized by the medical profession. The first documented medical examination using x-rays in North America was performed at Dartmouth Medical School on February 3, 1896 (Soule, 1966). Shortly thereafter, a medical specialty developed utilizing personnel skilled in the use of diagnostic x-rays. Between the years of 1920 and 1930, x-ray specialists (usually physicians) engaged men and women as apprentices and taught them the essentials of radiology (Soule, 1974).

Historians of higher education have traditionally viewed the apprenticeship system as the earliest formal method or process of educating members of a profession (Brubacher, 1968). The evolution of the profession of medicine is a good example of this, with two of its dimensions of learning, that of theory and clinical practice. However, the early training of radiologic technicians exemplified the apprenticeship system where practice was the rule and theoretical knowledge the exception. The apprenticeship system had limitations including, but not limited to:

- 1. the number of apprenticeships
- 2. a lack of consistency in training
- 3. the knowledge and experience gained which was related to the practitioner's background
- 4. training that often emphasized clinical experience over conceptual learning.

Because of these limitations, the apprenticeship system of learning was eventually replaced by professional medical schools. The medical school added theoretical knowledge to practical aspects, resulting in a more comprehensive education (Brubacher, 1968). Schools to produce radiologic technicians began operation during the decade of the 1920's.

The greatest influence in the transition from apprentice-type programs to professional schools of radiologic technicians resulted from the contributions of Ed C. Jerman (Coates, 1964). Radiology had begun to grow rapidly as a medical specialty during and immediately after World War I, but x-ray schools for training radiologic technicians were not yet functioning. Beginning in 1904, Jerman devoted his life to teaching of radiologic technicians, making him the first radiography instructor in the United States (Soule, 1966). Jerman began to give private instruction in 1917-18, when he became associated with the Victor X-ray Corporation, the forerunner to the General Electric Corporation. The purpose of this association was to develop a formal educational program for x-ray technicians. In 1920, Jerman founded the American Registry of X-ray Technicians (ARXT) and later organized the American Society of X-ray Technicians (ASXT), which directed educational aspects of the profession. In the United States, Jerman is deservedly recognized as "The Father of Radiography" (Carlton, 1992).

From the 1920's through the 1940's, radiologic technician programs were established in hospitals throughout the United States. Most of these schools were one-year in length and placed the greatest emphasis on the practical aspects of training (Soule, 1974). In an effort to standardize education for radiologic technicians, the American Registry Board in 1936 established a list of approved programs based on a survey of medical hospitals and schools (Soule, 1974). In 1944, the American Medical Association's Council on Medical Education and the American Society of X-ray Technicians jointly established inspection and accreditation guidelines for x-ray technician schools with the publication of the <u>Essentials for an Approved School of X-ray Technology</u> (Allied Health Education Directory, 1981). Within the field of radiologic technology these educational standards were known as "<u>The</u> <u>Essentials</u>." The <u>Essentials</u> have repeatedly been updated, most recently in 1990, and are now officially called <u>Essentials and Guidelines of an</u> <u>Accredited Educational Program for the Radiographer (Essentials</u>, 1990, Appendix A).

The 1960's and 1970's saw further moves towards improving professional training of radiologic technology programs through lengthened educational programs, curricular improvements, and for the first time, reliance upon standardized tests for admissions. In 1960, the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists (ARRT), American Society of Radiologic Technologists (ASRT), the American Medical Association (AMA), and the Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation (CAHEA) established two years as the minimum length for the radiologic technology educational program. These three bodies took the position that nothing less than a two-year radiologic technology program could provide the theoretical and practical training and experience necessary to produce a competent radiologic technologist (Soule, 1966). In that same year of 1960, ASRT developed a "Teacher's Syllabus," designed to outline curricular and course requirements for good radiologic technology programs (Allied Health Education Directory, 1981). In 1976, ASRT published a comprehensive Curriculum Guide for Programs in Radiologic Technology (ASRT, 1976). This guide included a model curriculum, course descriptions, outlines and behavioral objectives with designated competency levels.

Education in radiologic technology--from its foundation as an apprenticeship program to the first formal schools in hospitals--had been a profession learned from practice and observation with little if any theoretical framework (Koenig, 1971). In comparison with other allied health care curricula, radiologic technology programs were among the top one-third in terms of number of hours spent in clinical practice and among the lower third in terms of the number of classroom hours (Weil, 1967). Thus, while community college radiologic technology programs still rely on practical clinical training, appropriate learning experiences and curriculum have been sequenced to develop theoretical "critical thinking skill" competencies necessary for graduation.

Community Colleges

The supply of graduates in allied health fields depends not only on students' careers but also on the maintenance and expansion of educational opportunities. The emergence of the community college set the stage for what was to be the most significant trend in allied health education (Siebert, 1975). Support of the community college movement came from President Harry S. Truman's Commission on Higher Education. The commission was chaired by George F. Zook, one of the leading pioneers in the community college movement. The following quotation from the commission report reflects well the creed of the value of education and what Zook and others saw as the "democracy education" for community colleges:

Equal educational opportunities for all persons, to the maximum of their individual abilities and without regard to economic status, race, creed, color, sex, national origin, or ancestry, is a major goal of American democracy. Only an informed, thoughtful, tolerant people can maintain and develop a free society (Higher Education for American Democracy, 1947, Vol. 2, p. 7).

Later, President Dwight D. Eisenhower's Committee on Education Beyond the High School concluded: Communities or groups of neighboring communities faced with an impending shortage of higher education capacity will do well to consider new two year community colleges as part of the solution. Experience in a number of areas has demonstrated that, with carefully planned facilities and programs, community colleges can be highly effective in affording readily available opportunities for excellent education beyond the high school (Report of President Dwight D. Eisenhower's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, 1955-56, p. 12).

In a 1964 statement the American Association of Junior Colleges (AAJC) stated: "The two-year college offers unparalleled promise for expanding through the provision of comprehensive programs embracing job training as well as traditional liberal arts and general education" (American Association of Junior Colleges, 1964, p. 546). Calls for occupational education in the two-year colleges had been made as early as 1900 by William Rainey Harper, who suggested that "many students who might not have the courage to enter upon a course of four years' study would be willing to do the two years of work before entering business or the professional school" (Brick, 1963, 1965, p. 18). Vocational, occupational and technical programs grew during the thirty year period following America's entry into World War II, a period when economic growth centered around manufacturing industries. By 1968, the Bureau of Labor Statistics would report that 40 percent of all full- and part-time students in two-year colleges were enrolled in career oriented programs (Bushnell, 1973). The demand for well-trained professionals assisting physicians in the delivery of health care prompted the AMA Commission in the 1960's to coordinate the relationship of medical with allied health professions and services, and to recommend creation of a separate department within the AMA to handle all activities related to allied health education. As other professional accrediting bodies came to exert their impact on the curriculum, so too did radiologic technology

come to be influenced by the powerful AMA through the Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology (JRCERT). The JRCERT is vested with the responsibility and authority to evaluate radiologic technology programs that have requested accreditation services.

The evaluation activities of the JRCERT include receiving and analyzing Self-Study Reports, sending representatives to conduct a site visit of a radiologic technology program, and developing accreditation recommendations during scheduled committee meetings. The JRCERT sends their accreditation recommendations and rationale to CAHEA for action. Accreditation recommendations submitted by the JRCERT are reviewed by one of two CAHEA subcommittees. The subcommittee reviews are designed to ensure that due process and CAHEA and JRCERT polices and practices have been followed in arriving at accreditation recommendations.

Radiologic technologists and other allied health care professionals were affected by technological developments, and their education and training gradually became more specialized and lengthy (Stanfield, 1990). In recognition of this growing complexity, Congress passed the Allied Health Professions Training Act in 1966. This act was specifically designed to increase the opportunities for training of personnel in allied health professions and to improve the educational quality of the schools training such personnel. Given the nation's growing health care manpower needs and the emergence of community colleges, hospital-based allied health education programs suffered more closures than any other type of programs because the supply of graduates in allied health fields depended on the maintenance and expansion of educational opportunities. Formal education with college-based training programs supported by specific professional associations became the norm for almost all of the allied health profession.

The growth of technology has dramatically affected the health professions. Students entering allied health fields had to excel in academic theory as well as mastery of technical and clinical roles and procedures. During the transition from hospital-based to college-based radiologic technology programs, the American Society of Radiologic Technologists and the American College of Radiology promoted an orderly movement away from the totally clinical curriculum of the hospital-based training programs toward a more judicious mix of general education, theory, and specialized training anchored in more formalized education institutions (Light, 1973).

The move from hospital-based to college-based programs in radiologic technology took place during the period of greatest expansion of the community college movement, the 1960's. In 1960, there were 718 AMA approved radiologic technology programs, of which five were located at community colleges (Soule, 1969). As of January 1991, there were 666 Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation-approved programs, of which 199 (33.3 percent) were associate degree, 47 (14.1 percent) were baccalaureate degree, and 353 (47.0 percent) were hospital or medical center based (Allied Health Education Directory, 1990).

In a trend that accompanied a shift from hospital-based to college-based programs, the total number of radiography education programs decreased by 23 percent between 1976 and 1986. A sudden decline in graduations by approximately 15 percent had occurred, from 7,393 to 6,400 graduates in 1986 (Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation, 1987). Radiologic technologist educators became quite concerned, given the shortage of radiologic technologists that already existed. Radiologic technologist educators theorized that the decline might have been the result of potential students responding to fears of reduced demand generated by the new prospective medical payment schedules of the federal government. Established as a cost containment measure, the prospective payment system (PPS) attempted to shift the risk of cost to the health-care provider.

The decade of the 1980's saw radical change in the way health care was financed. Four major factors changed health care. There were shifts of the balance of power, a shift of the health care setting, an excess of doctors, and diagnostic related groups. Hospitals were paid a set amount for each patient in any of the established 471 known disease categories and diagnostic related groups (DRGs). This meant that the federal government would not pay beyond a set fee for an identified type of illness, no matter how long the patient stayed or what services were offered. As a result hospital admissions dropped and the length of patient stay was shorter, so the need for qualified radiologic technologists personnel in the hospital(s) declined. This tended to support the views of those radiologic technology educators who argued that the decline in entry into radiologic technology programs was the result of changes in federal payment schedules, as cited above.

Even if the decline in graduations is halted, there will still be a significant shortage of radiologic technology practitioners through the year 2000. The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that between 1986 and the year 2000, the number of jobs for radiologic technologists and technicians would grow by 65 percent, from 115,400 to 190,100 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1986). The types of personnel likely to be in demand in the future depends in large degree upon technological changes. For example, the emergence of new imaging modalities such as Magnetic Resonance Imagining (MRI) and Position Emission Tomography (PET), and

the application of the computer technology of imaging have generated major improvements in diagnostic capabilities.

The Institute of Medicine was chartered in 1970 by the National Academy of Sciences to enlist distinguished members of appropriate professions in the examination of policy matters pertaining to the health of the public. The Institute acts under both the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering's 1863 congressional charter to advise the federal government and the profession in the identification and investigation of issues related to medical care, research and education. According to the Institute of Medicine, factors related to the labor market demands for competent radiologic technologists will likely include, but not be limited to, the following:

- hospital utilization
- growth of all types of physician free-standing facilities
- licensure changes
- technological changes that will cause new areas of specialization
- results of technology assessment (Institute of Medicine, 1989).

The problem of selection, differentiation and guidance of candidates for admission to programs of studies for allied health occupations concerns all professional educators involved with the preparation of such individuals (Psychological Service Bureau, 1986-87). The issue directly stated is: where the number of applicants significantly exceeds program capacity, how can those students who will be most likely to succeed be best selected (Maynard, 1974)?

Given the data which clearly show a nationwide shortage of qualified radiologic technologists, it is imperative that selection criteria maximize a student's success in the didactic and clinical areas, as well as aid in predicting successful passage of the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists examination. The regular eligibility educational requirements for certification according to the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists require that candidates successfully complete a program of formal education which has been approved by the Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation (CAHEA). To those who have passed the examination and are otherwise eligible, a certificate is issued which confers upon the applicant the right to use the title Registered Technologist (ARRT, 1991).

Many allied health professional educators freely admit that the written certification test is primarily slanted toward the academic or cognitive achievement of the student, rather than the clinical performance or the non-cognitive aspects of the profession which do not rely upon many of the academic skills in the daily delivery of health care services (Kavanaugh, 1981). To achieve professional competence requires that radiographers apply knowledge of anatomy, physiology, positioning and radiographic techniques in the performance of their duties. Radiologic technologists should be able to communicate effectively with the public, other health professionals and their patient(s). The radiologic technologist should also display personal attributes of compassion, courtesy and concern in meeting the needs of the patient, especially since these are components of the Radiologic Technology Code of Ethics.

It is important here to make a distinction between the terms assessment and evaluation. Assessment is defined as "the process of gathering data and fashioning it into an interpretable form." It precedes the final decision-making stage of evaluation. Evaluation is defined as "the process of ascertaining or judging the value of something by use of a standard of appraisal." Final decisions concerning evaluation of students and their program completion are made from internal evidence and external criteria (Anderson, 1975). Strategies and instruments utilized for evaluation of student behaviors in the behavioral domains should be made available to support the score received on the written radiologic technology certification test.

Radiologic Technology Programs in the United States

The overall importance of the two-year college to the American democratic ideal of access to postsecondary education to the general population is well established in the literature. This importance has been debated in light of the perceived shift in two-year college curricular orientation from collegiate/transfer to vocational/technical (Baser, 1991).

Demographic studies show that the proportion of the United States population ages 18 to 23 years old will decline through the mid-1990s. Experts have predicted that this shrinkage of the so-called traditional college-age population will make it increasingly difficult for allied health programs, including radiologic technology programs, to attract qualified applicants (Institute of Medicine, 1989). The 1990 Report of Program Directors' Perspectives indicated that the total number of radiologic technology student applicants was 39,004. The relative number of radiologic technology student applicants who were considered by program directors to be qualified for admission into radiologic technology educational programs was 21,996 (Allied Health Education Directory, 1991). Thus while operating within institutions that profess open access, open door in their mission statements, radiologic technology programs reject one out of every two applicants.

Eleven types of institutions sponsor the Committee on Allied Health

Education and Accreditation (CAHEA) -- accredited programs as of October 31, 1991: (1) academic health centers and medical schools, (2) four-year colleges and universities, (3) community and junior colleges, (4) vocational and technical schools, (5) hospitals and medical centers of 1 to 99 beds, (6) hospitals and medical centers of 100 to 299 beds, (7) hospitals and medical centers of 300 to 499 beds, (8) hospitals and medical centers of 500 or more beds, (9) non-hospital health care facilities, (10) the Department of Veteran Affairs, and (11) the United States Department of Defense. Table II, "Radiologic Technology Programs Accredited by the Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation (CAHEA) in 1990, By Number and Percent," shows the number and percentage distribution of each major category of CAHEA-accredited radiologic technology programs in 1990.

TABLE II

Sponsoring Institutions # of	Programs	Percent
Academic Health Center/Medical School	28	4.2
Department of Defense	4	0.6
Department of Veteran Affairs	4	0.6
Four-Year College or University	47	7.0
Hospital or Medical Center: 1-99 Beds	1	
Hospital or Medical Center: 100-299 Beds	110	16.5
Hospital or Medical Center: 300-499 Beds	134	20.1
Hospital or Medical Center: 500 or more beds	108	16.2
Junior or Community College	199	29.8
Vocational or Technical School	30	4.5
Non-Hospital Health Care Facilities or Lab	1	0.5
Total Programs	666	100.0

RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS ACCREDITED BY THE COMMITTEE ON ALLIED HEALTH EDUCATION AND ACCREDITATION (CAHEA) IN 1990, BY NUMBER AND PERCENT

Note: 1. CAHEA is an allied health education accrediting agency sponsored by the American Medical Association (AMA).

2. Percentages do not add to 100.0 due to rounding.

The category "junior and community colleges" comprised 29.8 percent of all institutions sponsoring CAHEA-accredited programs, while hospital-based sponsors comprised 52.8 percent and vocational or technical schools comprised 4.5 percent. Four-year colleges or universities constituted 17 percent, while academic health centers comprised 4.2 percent. The Department of Defense (0.6 percent), Department of Veteran Affairs (0.6 percent), and non-hospital health care facilities (0.5 percent) comprised the remaining proportion of institutions sponsoring CAHEA-accredited programs.

The 1990 Report of Program Directors' Perspectives indicated that the total number of radiologic technology student applicants was 39,004. The relative number of radiologic technology student applicants who were considered by program directors to be qualified for admission into radiologic technology educational programs was 21,996 (Allied Health Education Directory, 1991). Thus, while operating with institutions that profess open access, open door in their mission statements, radiologic technology programs at community colleges reject one out of every two applicants.

Curriculum

A structured radiologic technology curriculum, with written course syllabi which describe learning objectives and competencies to be achieved for both didactic and supervised clinical education, should be provided to assure that adequate opportunity to acquire the needed knowledge and skills can take place (Essentials, 1990, Appendix A). The curriculum should be based upon clearly stated objectives that identify professional competencies and include cognitive, affective and psychomotor capabilities (<u>Essentials</u>, 1990).

The cognitive domain includes all objectives which deal with the intellectual behaviors of the learner. The psychomotor domain covers all those objectives in which the learner is engaged in some physical, kinesthetic behavior. The affective domain is concerned with attitudes, feelings, interests, and values of the learner. The cognitive and psychomotor domains are concerned with the question: What <u>can</u> the learner do? The affective domain is concerned with the question: What <u>will</u> the learner do? Many allied health professional educators freely admit that the Registry is primarily slanted toward the academic or cognitive achievement of the student in the curriculum, rather than the clinical performance or the non-cognitive aspects of the profession which do not rely upon many of the academic skills in the daily delivery of health care services (Kavanaugh, 1981).

According to the <u>Essentials</u>, curriculum content of radiologic technology programs should produce graduates who are both competent and compassionate. Instilled professional value should be evidenced by affective domain objectives and evaluations. Competencies developed by the radiologic technology program should be supported by specific behavioral objectives documented throughout the didactic and clinical curriculum and should include specific knowledge areas (<u>Essentials</u>, 1990).

Many educators have found that constructs devised by B. Bloom, D. Krathwohl, and their associates, in <u>Taxonomies of Educational Objectives</u> are useful in considering instructional objectives. Objectives in the cognitive domain deal with recall or recognition of knowledge, and the development of intellectual abilities and skills (Krathwohl, 1964).

Affective objectives emphasize a feeling tone, an emotion or a degree of acceptance or rejection (Krathwohl, 1964). Psychomotor domain objectives emphasize some muscular or motor control, some manipulation of material or objects, or some act which requires a neuromuscular coordination (Krathwohl, 1964). The six major classes of taxonomy in the cognitive domain are knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. The five major classes of taxonomy of the affective domain are receiving, responding, valuing, organizing, and characterizing. The five classes of psychomotor taxonomy are perception, set, guided response, and mechanism and complex overt response. The establishment of sound goals and objectives represents one of the most crucial steps in curriculum development. Without quality objectives, a course or curriculum might wander from topic to topic and result in students being unprepared for the Registry Examination or for the professional life that follows.

The development of meaningful outcomes for each course within the radiologic technology curriculum is important. As in all of vocational education, outcomes are of prime importance in radiologic technology programs. Outcomes can represent the extent to which students demonstrate competence once specific curriculum content has been taught. Some outcomes might be measurable while some others might not. Measurable outcomes in vocational and technical education such as radiologic technology can take many forms: for example, a student might identify the components of an x-ray tube, mix processor chemistry for film developments, or complete a quality assurance/quality control form. Measurable outcomes represent results which can be assessed with quantifiable data or in an objective manner. The other extreme represents outcomes that tend to be immeasurable. Examples might be

where a student develops an appreciation of the value of work in society, develops the ability to use leisure time wisely, or forms an attitude conducive to working in a group setting. Any vocational curriculum will have both measurable and immeasurable outcomes; thus objectives that are developed should address both cognitive and non-cognitive domains, and included in measurement of the cognitive should be an assessment of the psychomotor abilities as well as academic knowledge base.

Cognitive Predictors

The profession of radiography demands that entering students become highly skilled technically, qualified by education to perform imaging procedures as well as to be compassionate health care providers. The maintenance of standards of excellence in radiologic technology admissions is therefore necessary to assure accountability and quality care by program graduates. For this reason, it is important that reliable predictors, both cognitive and non-cognitive, are developed to assess the full potential for success of all individuals in the radiologic technology applicant pool (Blagg, 1985). The literature has shown that traditional admissions criteria, including previous academic performance and aptitude tests, have been effective cognitive predictors of academic success. Research findings on the use of non-cognitive predictors in the allied health field of radiologic technology, unfortunately, are quite limited.

Many researchers have designed studies to investigate admission criteria for allied health fields, however few exist for the field of radiologic technology. Published results of a study by Ballinger (1976) supported high school class rank as the most significant predictor of factors studied for performance on the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists (ARRT) Certificate Examinations. Ballinger performed a multiple regression analysis and found that the strongest predictor of success on the national Registry was high school graduating percentile. The second best predictor was the score on the English competency portion of the American College Test Program (ACT) English Composite score (Ballinger, 1976).

A study by McCausland and Stewart (1974) cited the results of an analysis of factors affecting the success of 154 college freshman enrolled at the University of Wyoming. College freshman grade point average, study skills, high school grade point average, and other variables were examined. The primary purpose of the study was the identification of study and attitudinal factors which were relevant to college success. It found the high school grade point average in addition to the ACT composite scores to be a good combination for selection purposes. While McCausland and Stewart concluded that high school averages tended to be the best cognitive indicator of college success, high school grade point averages did not indicate specific student strengths and weakness. Therefore, for diagnostic and counseling purposes at the college level, the high school grade point average had little value. The results of this study suggested that the cognitive and non-cognitive variables of academic aptitude, study skills and attitudes were important components of college success (McCausland, 1974).

A 1973 study by Chisson studied the records of college freshmen correlating high school grade point average, SAT scores, freshman English and mathematics grades, and total grade point average for the

first college semester. The study concluded that the high school grade point average was the most valued predictor (Chisson, 1985). Goldman and Slaughter (1976) attempted to discount grade point average composites as a valid predictor of total student performance. Errors in the selection of college students are universally related to the validity of the predictors employed. The generally weak validity with which grade point average in college has been predicted gives rise to a number of selection errors. This situation has produced criticism of standardized tests and a search for alternative models of fair selections. Goldman and Slaughter suggested that the problem was a criterion problem rather than a predictor problem. Their investigation demonstrated high validity for predicting grades in single classes. Since single class grades are components in the GPA composite, it seemed paradoxical that GPA prediction is inferior to grade point prediction in single classes. From their study, grade point averages of individual courses appeared to be valid, but due to different evaluation methods, and different grading standards in different types of college classes, performance in different subject areas was nonequivocal (Goldman and Slaughter, 1976).

A study by Tidd and Conine (1974) investigated correlations among physical therapy program courses, biological sciences, clinical performance and academic grade point average (GPA). High correlations between total grade point average and achievement in the biological and physical sciences were recorded, indicating that students performed better in clinical settings with increased biological and physical science training (Tidd, 1974).

Zufall (1974), in a review of research articles related to the selection of students in medical technology programs, found various

tests to be helpful as predictors of success. In a study by McCune and Rausch (1969), the predictor used was the Strong Vocational Interest Blank. The Strong Vocational Interest Blank employed 325 items to inquire about a respondent's interest in a wide range of occupations, occupational activities, hobbies, leisure activities, school subjects and types of people. The respondent was asked to indicate "like," "indifferent," or "dislike" in response to the items; the answers then were analyzed by computer to devise scores on 264 scales. The results of the Strong Vocational Index were reported on a sheet called a profile, which represented the scaled scores in an organized format, and interpretive information offered. Eberfield and Love (1970) used the Bell Adjustment Inventory, Kuder Preference Record, and Selective College Ability Test (SCAT) as an aptitude battery. The scores of these tests were used along with the grade point average (Zufall, 1974). The Selective College Ability Test is designed to measure academic aptitude, and has long been a staple in school testing programs. The Bell Adjustment Inventory reports six students scores concerning home, health, submissiveness, emotionality, hostility, and masculinity. The Kuder Preference Record (Kuder General Interest Survey) can help to provide a more complete picture of a school age person and can be especially helpful in making educational and vocational plans at various opportunities for choices in a person's career development.

Standardized Tests and Radiologic Technology Programs

The American College Test is a composite of four sub-tests which measure educational development in the areas of English, mathematics, social studies and natural sciences. The overall composite test is

regarded by their creators as measures of academic development which rely partly on the students' reasoning abilities and partly on their knowledge of the subject matter fields in an effort to emphasize their abilities to use both. The English usage sub-test measures students' understanding of the conventions of standard written English and the use of basic elements of effective expository writing: punctuation, grammar, sentence structure, diction, style, logic, and organization. The mathematics sub-test measures students' mathematical reasoning ability. The test emphasizes quantitative reasoning rather than recall of formulas, knowledge of specific techniques, or computational skill. The social studies reading sub-test measures students' ability to read, analyze, and evaluate social studies materials. There are two types of items: the first type (70 percent of the test) is based upon reading passages and the second (30 percent of the test) on general background or information. These items require inferential reasoning and the application of general information rather than rate recall of specific facts. The natural science reading sub-test measures students' ability to read, analyze and evaluate material from the natural sciences. The items require inferential reasoning and the application of general information rather than the rate recall of specific facts. The composite will be the average score for the English, mathematics, social studies, and natural sciences tests.

American College Test assessment results are summarized on the ACT Assessment College Report, which ACT sends to institutions and agencies designated by each student. The ACT Assessment also includes an interest inventory to help students compare interests with those of students who have completed various major college majors, and identifies groups of jobs the student may want to explore. According to the ACT,

the ACT examination is administered in 50 states while the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) is administered in 22 states (Appendices B & C). About two-thirds of the majority of accepted freshmen nationally were in the highly-selective or top 10 percent of high school graduating classes which had average ACT Composite Scores between 27 and 31, while the SAT total (Verbal + Math) was between 1120-1290. The majority of accepted freshmen in the selective or top 25 percent of high school graduating classes had average ACT Composite Scores between 22-27, while the SAT total (Verbal + Math) was between 920-1090. The majority of accepted freshmen in the traditional or top 50 percent of high school graduating classes had average ACT Composite Scores of 20-23, while the SAT total (V + M) was between 810-950. Because the ACT examination is administered in 28 states and is used to a high degree at public community colleges, opinion rating questions were developed for the Survey of Recruitment, Admission and Selection Criteria for Radiologic Technology Programs.

Lauer (1981) examined the effects of six manipulatable factors on Registry performance in 15 Western college-based programs. Hospital-based and university medical center-based radiography programs were not studied. Two-year associate degree radiography programs delivered by community colleges and universities were studied. The findings implied that students had an equal chance for success on the Registry examination regardless of a number of factors including the educational expertise of faculty, the institutional academic degree requirement, the number of clinical education hours required, the methods used in assigning student to clinical affiliates, the use of on-campus energized laboratories, and the use of Registry preparation and review courses (Lauer, 1981). With the variety of training approaches that exist among college-based radiography programs, further research will be needed to substantiate educational standards.

In Kavanaugh's study, grades in selected high school courses such as biology and algebra were compared to grades received in selected courses in the radiography curriculum. Biology was chosen as the admission reference because of its similarity to anatomy and physiology. Algebra was chosen as the mathematics reference because of its use as a required course and the frequency of algebraic problems in radiation physics, and principles of exposure, and problem solving questions on the certification examination. The results of the study appeared consistent with literature that cited high school grade point average, algebra grades and biology grades in the selection of radiologic technology students as valid predictors of success. The correlations between high school algebra and biology and radiography program counterparts were significant enough to continue to use these subjects as admission criteria, according to Kavanaugh. Kavanaugh made no statistical comparison between high school grade point average or grades in biology or algebra and the Registry Examination results, although reference was made to five first-time program failures on the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists Examination and their high school grade point averages, as well as algebra and biology grades (Kavanaugh, 1981).

A study by Schimfhauer and Broski (1976) investigated allied health students, examining the variables of the ACT subtest scores, high school grade point average and five subscores of the Allied Health Profession's Admission Test (AHPAT). Their study revealed that the math subtest of the ACT outranked preprofessional grade point averages in predicting success. When all allied health programs were combined, the grade point average was again the strongest predictor variable followed by the mathematics subtest of the ACT, and the Allied Health Profession's Admission Test (AHPAT) verbal subtest score. Schimfhauer did not have evidence on Radiologic Technology as a specific allied health profession (Schimfhauer, 1976).

A study by Stankovich (1977) investigated the statistical predictability of academic performance. This study concluded that a student's success could be predicted by high school grade point average and college entrance test examination scores, specifically by examining the ACT mathematics subtest scores (Stankovich, 1977). A study completed by Bello (1977) concluded that valid factors predictive of success or failure were best determined by age, comparative placement and guidance program (CGP), reading and sentence scores, high school algebra grades and college science grades (Bello, 1977).

Merritt (1972) examined the predictive validity of the American College Test in determining college grade point averages for students coming from low socioeconomic backgrounds. Merritt concluded that the ACT was a valid predictor of college grades for students from low socioeconomic backgrounds (Merritt, 1972). Ferguson (1975) cited self-reported grades in ACT or Scholastic Aptitude Test composite scores and high school rank as admission criteria. Ferguson also reported that the American College Test was used for more than admissions at many colleges. Ferguson noted that when American College Test scores were combined with either high school grade point averages or high school ranking, the results were highly predictive of college success (Ferguson, 1979).

Wesolowski (1988) found that 45.2 percent of radiologic technology programs used the American College Test examination, 31.5 percent used the School/College Ability Test (SCAT), and 1.7 percent used the Psychological Test Examination for Radiologic Technology. About eighteen percent (18 percent) of the radiologic technology programs indicated they used no pre-admission test, and Wesolowski questioned whether this was an oversight on the part of the respondents or if an open-door policy was in effect.

Francis (1990) investigated the relationship between pre-admission ACT Composite Scores and the Registry Examination for two-year community college programs. Program officials were surveyed to determine if there were any similarities among individuals who had failed the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists examination on their first attempt. High school grade point averages; algebra, biology and chemistry grades; college grade point average; college grades in courses such as anatomy and physiology; radiographic exposure; and exposure techniques and physics were all examined. Results demonstrated no similarities among this group who had failed the ARRT in their first attempt. Only one item did appear to be related, and that was that six of the seven failing students had ACT composite scores of 14 or lower. The program director decided to determine the connection, if any, of the students' pre-admission ACT composite scores and the graduates' scores on the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists examination. The resulting modification of the radiologic technology program admission criteria and its effect upon the Registry examination results revealed a threefold reduction in failure rate after the revised admission criteria were implemented. The modified admission criteria implemented in 1982 was as follows: high school transcript evaluation, interview and ACT Composite Score. The major change in the admission criteria was that the ACT Composite Score was relied upon much more heavily than in the past for making admission decisions (Francis, 1990).

A study by Macomber and Sanders (1984) studied the effect of a mock Registry examination score and a student's grade point average on the student's performance on the actual Registry examination itself. The results of their research showed that the mock registry score and the student's grade point average were statistically significant in predicting success on the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists examination. A student's mock registry score was found to be the most reliable predictor of success on the American Registry of Radiologic Technologist's examination (Macomber, 1984).

Competency-based learning and clinical performance can also be related to cognitive criteria, such as grades and intellectual ability, but typically only negligible relationships have been established (Wingard, 1973). Therefore, the traditional admission predictors of grades and intellectual ability can be said to be ineffective measures of competency-based learning and clinical performance in the field of radiologic technology. Attention is now turned to a brief review of the literature of professional medical education, with emphasis on the non-cognitive and affective domains.

The Kegel-Flomm study (1975) investigated the performance rating of medical interns on four dimensions: knowledge of medical sciences, clinical effectiveness, interpersonal effectiveness, and overall competence/professional promise as a physician. In addition, the Kegel-Flomm study questioned the extent to which ratings of intern performance could be predicted from earlier measures of aptitude, achievement and personality. They found that when admission data, personality inventory measures, and medical school performance were considered together, (1) the supervisors' ratings of interns were best forecast by earlier medical school faculty ratings, (2) self-ratings were forecast best by a combination of personality inventory measures and medical school grades, and (3) peer ratings were best predicted by a combination of personality inventory measures. Premedical grades, Medical College Admission Test scores, and admission interview ratings failed to predict ratings of intern performance. The performance of medical interns is apparently associated more with personal qualities and medical training than with relative levels of aptitude and undergraduate achievement (Keqel-Flomm, 1975).

Traditional admission predictors are cognitive in nature and have been proven to be ineffective in measuring clinical performance (Richards, 1962). Quality clinical performance requires not only cognition but also proficiency in the affective and psychomotor domains. It is in these latter domains that new predictors would be beneficial. Coupled with the traditional predictors, they would provide a more complete appraisal of the full potential of the applicants. Attention is now turned to a discussion of the research related to these non-cognitive predictors.

Non-Cognitive Predictors

The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education outlined a variety of admission considerations that should be taken into account as individuals responsible for professional education programs scrutinize their applicants (Carnegie Council, 1977). These criteria include special abilities of an affective or psychomotor type, special interests, special demographic personal identifications such as ethnicity or county of residence, special personal characteristics, contributions to diversity of the student community, potential contribution to the profession, contribution to the identity of the institution and contribution to the political, economic, or community needs of the professional program. The majority of the commission's considerations can be considered to be non-cognitive variables (Dietrich, 1981).

Quantifying an applicant's affective characteristics is perhaps the most difficult task in student selection at any level of graded education. The rubric of the affective domain includes traits such as self-concept, self-esteem, values, motivation, attitudes, and interests. Those responsible for student selection should identify the importance of personality characteristics and their special attributes or traits (Dietrich, 1981). Because the maintenance of standards of excellence in radiologic technology admissions is necessary to assure accountability and quality care by program graduates, it is essential that reliable predictors, both cognitive and non-cognitive, be developed to assess the full potential for success of all individuals in the radiologic technology applicant pool (Blagg, 1985).

Research findings of the use of non-cognitive predictors in the allied health field of radiologic technology is very limited. In order to increase predictive efficiency, some investigators have added non-cognitive variables to their data bases (Blagg, 1985). Traditional admissions criteria, including previous academic performance and aptitude tests, have been researched to be effective cognitive predictors of academic success.

In a study by Murden (1978) the researcher examined admissions data, including both cognitive factors and interview ratings for five classes of University of Missouri at Columbia Medical School. The study revealed that each applicant was rated on the traits of maturity,

non-academic achievement, rapport, and motivation for medicine. Neither of the cognitive measures of grade point average (GPA) or Medical College Admissions Test scores were related significantly to internship scores. The authors concluded that had greater emphasis been placed on personal characteristics or non-cognitive variables in the admission criteria, the overall abilities of graduates of the classes would have been enhanced (Murden, 1978).

Keck (1979) utilized both cognitive and non-cognitive variables in an attempt to predict clinical performance of medical residents at the University of Missouri-Kansas City (UMKC) School of Medicine. The cognitive variables included undergraduate grade point average, scores obtained on a "Quarterly Profile Examination" (a multiple choice examination administered every three months throughout a student's matriculation taken prior to graduation from medical school) and scores on Parts I and II of the National Board of Medical Examiners. Non-cognitive variables included Holland's Self-Directed Search, the Omnibus Personality Inventory, and total scores received on an admissions interview. Clinical scores were obtained from a residency evaluation form filled out by clinical supervisors of their residents. The authors concluded that a combination of cognitive and non-cognitive predictor variables function much better than any individual variable, or even any specific class of variables, in predicting success in clinical performance (Keck, 1979).

Molidor and his associates (1978) investigated the effectiveness of non-cognitive measures of problem-solving ability as screening mechanisms for medical school admissions. The measures of problem-solving ability included the Pictorial Reasoning Test, the Remote Associations Test, the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal, the State Trait Anxiety Inventory, the Anxiety Scale, and the Study Habits Inventory. The scores received on these measures were regressed on several measures of student performance in medical school, including appearance, health, ability to work with others, adaptability, attitude regarding supervision, nursing care, dependability, charting, care of property, interest in nursing, judgement, professional conduct, punctuality, planning ability, work relationship to patient, teaching interest and teaching ability. In the stepwise multiple regression, Molidor and associates entered Medical College Admission Test scores and previous grade point averages first, and then entered the six independent measures of problem solving ability, with only gain scores being reported. The highest gain was associated with Clinical Problem Scores (Molidor, 1978). The authors did not report which of the measures contributed most to the gain scores; therefore these results should be viewed with caution (Blagg, 1985).

Sheenan (1979) studied the relationship between moral judgement as a function of integrity and the clinical performance of medical students. Students were rated by faculty in eighteen areas of personal characteristics. Moral judgement was measured in relation to Kohlberg's six stage theory of moral development. Kohlberg identified three levels of moral reasoning: (1) preconventional, stages one and two (lowest levels); (2) conventional, stages three and four; and (3) principal, stages five and six (highest levels). These stages were measured by Kohlberg's Standard Moral Judgement Interview and by Rest's Defining Issues Test. These two measures of moral reasoning were correlated to the clinical performance scores. Results showed a significant correlation between Kohlberg's Standard Moral Judgement Interview score and clinical rating scores. Canonical correlation analysis, which

relates to the most significant forms or schemata to which general equations, statements, or expressions may be reduced without loss of generality, showed a statistically significant relationship existing between the Defining Issues Test scores and the 18 clinical performance characteristics measured by faculty ratings (Sheenan, 1979).

Finegan (1967) investigated the attribute of motivation as a contributing factor in clinical performance of nursing students. Motivation was measured with the Personal Values Inventory, while the student performance was measured by scores received on the Scholarship Aptitude Test, the National League of Nursing Achievement Test, grade point average in nursing courses, and scores received on the Clinical Raters Evaluation Sheet and Clinical Form Score. Students were evaluated using the Clinical Raters Evaluation Sheet (CRES) in areas of personal characteristics, technical performance, and relation to co-workers. The Clinical Form Score was based upon student performance in 17 clinical areas including appearance, health, adaptability, relationship to patient and teaching ability. The highest correlations to the Clinical Raters Evaluation Sheet scores were the Direction and Insight Scores of the Personal Values Inventory. The highest correlations to the Clinical Form Scores were Direction and Planning Scores of the Personal Values Inventory. The findings suggested that it might be possible to develop a standardized measure of motivation that could help to predict nursing student success (Finegan, 1967).

Ryden (1977) hypothesized that nursing students with higher interpersonal relationship scores would achieve higher scores in clinical rotations. Following this view, competencies developed by an allied health program should be supported by specific behavioral objectives documented throughout a clinical curriculum, and that the

student(s) should competently perform a full range of medical duties and procedures during the assigned rotations through a clinical education center hospital. The student's skills in interpersonal relations were evaluated via the Interpersonal Relationship Rating Scale (IRRS). The correlation between clinical examination scores and the mean cumulative rating of the students on the IRRS was significant, (r = 0.45), supporting the Ryden's hypothesis (Ryden, 1977).

In another study of the relationship between self-concept and the clinical performance of nursing students, Burgess (1980) administered the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale to 100 students entering a baccalaureate nursing program. The collected data did not support the hypothesis that a significant relationship could be found between the self-concept of the undergraduate nursing students and their clinical performance (Burgess, 1980).

Jenssen (1969) studied the cognitive style variable of dogmatism, measured by the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, positioning on the democratic-autocratic continuum measured by the Traditional Family Ideology Scale, and the relationship to successful nursing performance. Nursing students were administered both instruments upon entry into the four-year nursing program, at the end of their freshman year, and at the end of six months of clinical training. Senior and graduate nursing students were administered the instruments as well. The results showed that freshman students did not change in dogmatism but did exhibit less authoritativeness than did the graduate nursing students. There was no significant difference in dogmatism scores between graduate and senior nursing students. The author suggested that results of the study indicated a usefulness of the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and the

Traditional Family Idology Scale instruments for selection of students into the nursing program (Sheenan, 1979).

Gunning (1981) examined a cognitive style paradigm (field-independence-dependence), critical thinking ability, and clinical problem solving ability of baccalaureate nursing students. Field-independence-dependence was measured by the Group Embedded Figures Test. Critical thinking ability was measured by the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal, and clinical problem solving was measured by the Nursing Performance Simulation Instrument. The results showed a significant correlation between field independence and critical thinking ability, and between field independence and clinical problem-solving ability. There was no significant correlation found between critical thinking ability and clinical problem-solving ability (Gunning, 1981).

Bailey (1969) investigated the relationship between psychiatric clinical internship scores and scores on the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB), the Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MPI) and the Florida Placement Examination for female occupational therapists. The Strong Vocational Interest Blank employs 325 items to inquire about a respondent's interest in a wide range of occupations, occupational activities, hobbies, leisure activities, school subjects and types of people. The respondent is asked to indicate "Like", "Indifferent", or "Dislike" in response to the items; the answers then are analyzed by computer to derive scores on 264 scales. The results are reported on a sheet called a profile, which represents the scaled score in an organized format with interpretive information. The authors attributed the high effectiveness of the SVIB in predicting the performance rating component to the fact that the SVIB scales are not only a measure of interest but also a measure of various components of personality, aptitude and perhaps even attitudes. Thus, adding the Strong Vocational Interest Blank may be a useful instrument for predicting performance ratings (Bailey, 1969).

Interpersonal communications is a factor that has been incorporated into admissions systems for medical technologists receiving a baccalaureate degree (Rifken, 1981). The medical technology programs admission system studied utilized both academic and nonacademic factors. Nonacademic factors included an overall impression score that "generates an overall positive response in interpersonal communications." This score was tabulated from scores received on an interview and from letters of reference. The authors found that this score correlated significantly with scores received by students on clinical ratings in microbiology, chemistry and hematology in their senior year but not with work experience ratings obtained from the first superiors of graduates in their first year of employment. The authors suggested that interpersonal communications may be a major component of what is actually being measured by clinical supervisors (Rifkin, 1981). An interview or letter(s) of reference can be classified as information sources of the affective domain, usually classified as a non-cognitive predictor.

Bork (1980) studied the role of cognitive style in the clinical evaluation performance of undergraduate physical therapy students in medical problem solving. The paradigm identified an individual's method of information gathering (perceptive or receptive mode) and information evaluation (systematic or intuitive mode). The results of the study provided evidence that individuals who scored high on patient history-taking and physical assessment were more likely to operate in the intuitive mode. Patient data omitted on a patient's medical chart were mostly associated with a student's grade point average. Information gathered by students in the perceptive mode differed from conclusions reached by physical therapy experts. This study indicated that cognitive styles as well as content knowledge influenced the ability of an individual to solve patient problems (Bork, 1980). Therefore, it was hypothosized that cognitive and non-cognitive variables could be used to evaluate an undergraduate allied health student's ability to solve patient problems.

In summary, cognitive as well as non-cognitive variables could explain the variance in a student's clinical performance score(s) for medical education as well as nursing and allied health education. Certain allied health professions, especially those dealing with patient assessment (which includes radiologic technology), demand a high level of the complex cognitive skills of analysis and synthesis. In a 1981 study, Wesolowski suggested that in clinical education, the student radiographer must be observed and evaluated in many different situations with respect to numerous psychomotor abilities. Wesolowski also argued that the evaluation could be used as one of many tools to impact knowledge and skills to the student (Wesolowski, 1981).

Quality clinical performance for graduates of community college nursing and allied health programs requires not only cognition but also proficiency in the affective and psychomotor domains. It is in these latter domains, especially the affective, that useful non-cognitive predictors of success would be most beneficial. When coupled with traditional predictors, they would provide a more complete appraisal of the full potential of applicants to radiologic technology programs. Given the high applicant rejection rates, the existence of these selective programs within open-access open door institutions, and the
need for the field to increase the number of underrepresented women and minorities, it is vital that the selection process be done with accuracy while accounting for sometimes diverse programs objectives and goals.

Quantifying applicant affective characteristics is perhaps the most difficult task in allied health student selection. The rubric of the affective domain includes such traits as self-concept, self-esteem, values, attitudes and interests. The four major information sources (essays, interviews, standardized personality tests [eg.: Myers Briggs Type Indicator], letters of recommendations) can be used in the affective assessment of applicants. The absence of a universally acceptable taxonomy makes precise measurements in the psychomotor domain much more complex. The major elements of the domain, namely fine and gross motor skills and perceptual-motor abilities, can be evaluated in terms of relative importance with respect to entry-level tasks analysis prior to use in student selection to aptitude testing for radiologic technology programs (Dietrich, 1981). Attention is now turned to the area of aptitude testing.

Aptitude Testing

The content of the Psychological Services Bureau (PSB) Health Occupations Aptitude Examination is the result of an assessment of the requirements and needs expressed by those professionals having the responsibility in preparing qualified, competent practitioners for health careers in a variety of specialized fields such as nursing and radiologic technology.

The problem of selection, differentiation and guidance of candidates for admission concerns all involved with the education of individuals

for allied health professions. Programs functioning without comprehensive screening procedures may find a student's chances of success quite poor, and since allied health programs often cost three times to five times more than regular academic courses to deliver at community college, it is important to "match" students and programs in an efficient manner. The PSB Health Occupations Aptitude Examination is specifically designed to measure a conglomerate of abilities, skills, knowledge and attitudes which are crucial to what may be called "aptitude" for successful participation in the allied health programs at community colleges. The PSB Health Occupations Aptitude Examination has been revised, in part because of the extensive analysis of field test data and feedback from field test administration that has been conducted over the years. The revised PSB Health Occupations Aptitude Examination is especially designed for Allied Health Education Programs with demonstrated criterion-related (predictive) validity. The Revised PSB Health Occupations Aptitude Examination provides a relevant unbiased, culture-minimized assessment of thinking skills and essential functional information.

In 1983, and again in 1985, Reinking administered the PSB-Health Occupations Aptitude Examination to students in a junior college Surgical Technology program. The findings indicated a positive correlation between the PSB-Health Occupations Aptitude Examination student scores earned at the time of admission to the Surgical Technology Program and the student's subsequent cumulative grade point average at the time of completion of the program (Reinking, 1983 and 1985).

Miller (1985) used the PSB-Health Occupations Aptitude Examination to predict achievement (success or failure) in the completion of

academic and clinical work in radiologic technology. The use of the examination took place over a period of four years. The results obtained from the PSB-Health Occupations Aptitude examination, which was administered to students prior to admission to school, coincided with the subsequent earned score on the evaluative criterion connected with the student's completion of the educational program for radiologic technologists. The outcome of this study showed that the PSB-Health Occupations Aptitude Examination scores were predictive of earned scores on the National Registry Examination (Miller, 1985).

A study by Myers (1985) compared the relationship between scores earned by hospital-based radiologic technology students, at the time of admission to the program, on the PSB-Health Occupations Aptitude Examination with (1) the cumulative grade point average on the graduated classes of 1984 and 1985, (2) the final examination scores of the graduated classes of 1984 and 1985, (3) the cumulative grade point average of the class of 1986, and (4) the cumulative grade point average of the class of 1987 (two months in the program). This first part of the study involved comparing PSB-Health Occupations Aptitude Examination scores earned by students at the time of admission to the radiologic technology program with the student's subsequent cumulative grade point average. The question that was raised was did the scores from the five tests comprising the PSB-Health Occupations Aptitude Examination predict subsequent cumulative grade point averages for students in the classes described above? The second part of Myers study concerned the establishment of any relationship between the students' scores earned on the PSB-Health Occupations Aptitude Examination and the students' scores earned on the final examination. A review of Myers' findings indicated there existed a positive correlation between the PSB-Health Occupations

Aptitude Examination scores and subsequent student cumulative grade point averages, as well as scores earned on the programs final examination. Programs functioning without a comprehensive screening procedure may find a student's chances of success quite poor (Myers, 1985).

The Registry Examination

The American Registry of Radiologic Technologists (ARRT) requires that candidates who plan to take its Registry Examination must have successfully completed a program of formal education which has been approved by the Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation. All applicants who have completed a program of formal education must have completed the eligibility requirements by the date of the examination take this 200-item objective test. The examinee is given three hours to complete the examination, which is administered March, July and October annually across the United States. The examination scores are reported as scale scores, with a scaled score of 75 constituting a passing grade. The examination is divided into five subject areas: radiation protection, equipment operation and maintenance, image production and evaluation, radiographic procedures, and patient care and management. The range of scores for the Registry examination is a low of/and a range of 99, according to the ARRT officials. The reliability of the ARRT examination varies from test date to test date, but the Kuder-Richardson (KR20) is reported to be in the range of .92 to .94 for the ARRT examinations given between 1979 and 1986. The Kuder-Richardson formula 20, a type of reliability coefficient, provides relatively conservative estimates of the

coefficient of equivalence. In terms of test theory, the coefficient of equivalence is the most desirable index of test reliability, since it involves two different representative samples of items.

The examination administered in 1991 was the second set assembled based upon the revised content specifications developed as a result of the ARRT Jobs Analysis Update Project. Approximately 15,000 examinations were administered in the three component parts of the radiologic technology profession--radiography, nuclear medicine technology, and radiation therapy technology--in the three separate 1991 testing sessions. Radiography examinations accounted for approximately 88 percent (n = 8016) of the total, nuclear medicine technology for about 5 percent (n = 561), and radiation therapy technology for about 7 percent (n = 685). There were a total of 9,352 first-time regular examinees who took the 1991 Registry. Table III, the "Performance of First-Time Examinees on the American Resigtry of Radiologic Technologists Examination, 1991," shows overall performance of the examinees in the three administrations made that year. According to the report of the percent passing, about 19 percent of all radiography examinees failed the test the first time.

TABLE III

Test	Administration	Mean Scaled Score	Standard Deviation	Percent Passing
	March 1991	79.7	8.30	74.7
Dadiomanhu	July 1991	82.3	7.14	85.7
Radiography	October 1991	81.8	7.26	84.1
	Mean for 1991	81.9	7.32	84.1

PERFORMANCE OF FIRST-TIME EXAMINEES ON THE AMERICAN REGISTRY OF RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGISTS EXAMINATION, 1991

TABLE IV

<u> </u>		RAD	Р Н Ү		
REGION	DATA	March	July	October	
Northeast	x	78	82	82	
	N	(79)	(895)	(1052)	
Southeast	x	82	83	82	
	N	(146)	(1033)	(858)	
Central	x	80	82	82	
	N	(96)	(111)	(789)	
West	x	80	82	81	
	N	(322)	(884)	(786)	

FIRST-TIME PERFORMANCE OF EXAMINEES, ON THE AMERICAN REGISTRY OF RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGISTS MARCH, JULY, AND OCTOBER EXAMINATIONS, BY REGIONS, 1991

Notes: x = mean (average) scaled score for regular first-time examinees.

N = number of regular first-time examinees.

The examination scores are reported as scaled scores, with a scaled score of 75 constituting a passing grade.

Table IV, "First-Time Performance of Examinees on the American Reigstry of Radiologic Technologists March, July, and October Examinations by Regions, 1991," groups the performance data into four regions of the country. The mean performance is reported in terms of scaled scores. Scaled scores are not percentages, but rather are a statistically derived unit of measurement taking into account differences in the average difficulty of test forms. The forms of the examination used for the March, July and October administrations are made up of different sets of items; the use of scaled scores allows direct comparison of scores on these forms. This would not be true if scores were reported as percentages.

Summary

The absence of current information on radiologic technology selection procedures for programs based in community colleges provided the impetus for this national study. From the preceding review of the literature, including literature related to the student selection processes at medical schools, nursing programs and other health care programs, there appears to be a number of cognitive and non-cognitive variables that have been identified that can be used to predict didactic and clinical performance in the various allied health professions. It would appear then that radiologic technology program directors should maintain standards of excellence in admissions by use of cognitive as well as non-cognitive predictors to assess applicants more completely and accurately (Essentials, 1990).

Demographic studies show that the proportion of the U.S. population 18 to 23 years old has been declining and will continue to decline through the mid 1990s. This will make it difficult for all allied health programs, including radiologic technology programs, to attract traditional-aged qualified applicants. Many other opportunities will compete for this population's attention. Therefore, greater efforts will have to be made to maintain allied health's market share of perspective students. This was noted by the Institute of Medicine in 1989: A key to the viability of allied health education is its capacity to maintain its share of qualified students from the traditional college-age applicant pool while tapping into less traditional pools of students particularly minority students (Institute of Medicine, 1989, p. 7).

Comprehensive data collection concerning applicants to allied health programs is not currently being performed. The Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation (CAHEA) does perform annual surveys in several allied health fields regarding whether the number of applications to programs are increasing, decreasing, or remaining the same. Unpublished survey data from the American Society of Allied Health Professions suggest that radiologic technology programs average only slightly more applicants than are needed to fill classes, despite consistently good long-term employment projections for radiologic program graduates, as shown by various Bureau of Labor Statistics labor market studies. Radiologic technology academic administrators are therefore concerned that with fewer applicants from which to select, the quality of the student will decline. For these above mentioned reasons, student selection presents one of the most perplexing problems for health care educators, including radiologic technology educators.

From the preceding review of literature, there was research of reliable predictors to use as selection criteria of perspective radiologic technology students (Ballinger, 1976; McCausland, 1974; Chission, 1985; Schimfhauer and Broski, 1976). Quantifying the radiologic technology applicants' affective characteristics increases predictive efficiency (Dietrich, 1981; Blagg, 1985; Murden, 1978; Keck, 1979; Finegan, 1967; Burgess, 1980). Aptitude testing should be used to measure aptitude for the educational process structure to produce proficient allied-health practitioners (Reinking, 1983, 1985). The outcome of aptitude testing scores can be predictive of earned scores on the American Registry of Radiologic Technologist Examination (Miller, 1985; Myers, 1985).

Based on the review of the literature, it is clear that the field of radiologic technology is a relatively young field, that the community college should provide "equal opportunities for all persons," and that the cognitive and non-cognitive characteristics of entry-level radiologic technology students can be evaluated. The question remains as to which cognitive and non-cognitive variables will be predictive of success in community college radiologic technology educational programs, and how these variables can be best assessed.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The primary purpose of this study was to assess and analyze perceptions of community college radiologic technology program directors and their usage of selection criteria for prospective students. The perceptions and opinions were quantified in terms of the participant's responses on <u>The Survey of Recruitment</u>, <u>Admission and Selection Criteria</u> <u>for Radiologic Technology Programs</u>, an instrument developed for this study.

This chapter includes the components of the design of research through which the purpose of the study was accomplished. This chapter is divided into the following sections: definition and selection of populations, a description of the research instrument and the procedures used in data collection, and the statistical methods used in manipulating the collected data.

The Definition and Selection of Populations

Due to the focused scope of this study, population of community college radiologic technology programs in the United States were included and comprised the 199 community college radiologic technology programs that awarded an Associate Degree in Radiologic Technology. Community

college radiologic technology program directors familiar with and responsible for student assessment and selection were surveyed. Program directors were surveyed because program officials are most often directly responsible for establishing procedures for determining that prospective applicants meet academic and technical standards required for admission to community college radiologic technology programs. Program directors were also surveyed because radiologic technology program officers are knowledgeable of the Registry requirements and JRCERT accreditation guidelines.

Radiologic technology programs are generally two to four years in length depending on program design, objectives and the degree or certificate awarded. A high school diploma or its equivalent, with an educational background in basic sciences and mathematics, is generally required prior to entry. Additional admission requirements of the sponsoring educational institution also must be met (Allied Health Education Directory, 1990).

According to the Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology (JRCERT), a structured curriculum with clearly written course syllabi which describes learning objectives and competencies to be achieved for both the didactic and supervised clinical education components should be provided for by the radiologic technology program. The curriculum should be based on clearly stated objectives that identify professional competencies and enhance cognitive and non-cognitive capabilities. Curriculum content to produce graduates who are both competent and compassionate should also be provided. Instilled professional values should be evidenced by affective domain objectives and evaluations (refer to page 6 in Appendix A, Essentials, 1990).

The evaluation system should be related to program philosophies, goals, and competencies, provide students with ongoing as well as terminal evaluations and serve as a reliable indicator of the effectiveness of instruction and course design criteria for successful performance. The evaluation system should be equitably applied without discrimination (Essentials, 1990). The American College of Radiology, the American Medical Association, and the American Society of Radiologic Technologists cooperate to establish, maintain and promote appropriate standards of quality for educational programs which meet or exceed the standards as outlined in the Essentials. Accreditation is a process of external peer review in which a private, non-governmental agency or association grants public recognition to an institution or specialized program of study that meets certain established qualifications and educational standards, as determined through initial and subsequent periodic evaluations. The purpose of the accreditation process, then, is to provide a professional judgement of the quality of the educational institution or program and to encourage its continued improvement. The maximum duration of accreditation for radiologic technology under JRCERT is five years.

Research Instrument

The Survey of Recruitment, Admission and Selection Criteria for Radiologic Technology Programs (Appendix D) was developed for use in assessing the perceptions of community college radiologic technology program directors and their use of selection criteria for prospective students. The questionnaire was designed as a mail survey to assess the opinions of community college radiologic program directors, but had applicability to program faculty or others responsible for determining which prospective student applicants meet academic and technical standards required for admission to community college radiologic technology programs. The five point Likert-type questionnaire was intended to measure the general attitudes toward community college radiologic technology programs by measuring the general opinions of individuals toward three facets-cognitive and non-cognitive domains-which were deemed as most important in determining the overall attitude toward community college radiologic technology education (Essentials, 1990).

The cognitive domain includes all objectives which deal with the intellectual behaviors of the learner. The non-cognitive domain includes personality characteristics and their special attributes or traits with emphasis on some muscular or motor control.

Research Instrument Development

The development of the Survey of Recruitment, Admission and Selection Criteria for Radiologic Technology Programs involved the investigation of an expansive list of items found in the related literature and derived from opinion, attitudes and beliefs regarding community college radiologic technology student selection. This complete set of opinion ratings and general information questions was administered to five (5) nationally recognized program directors who determine which prospective student applicants meet academic and technical standards required for admission to radiologic technology programs. While attending the Fifty-Fifth Annual Convention of Kansas Society of Radiologic Technologists at Dodge City, Kansas in 1991. Revisions of the survey were based upon the advice of these expert program directors employed by four-year college or university, vocational or technical schools, and hospital or medical centers radiologic technology programs. A 52 item, five scale ("strongly agree," "agree," "disagree," strongly disagree," and "no opinion") Likert-type questionnaire was sent to the 199 community college radiology technology programs in the United States. The source utilized for selection of accredited community college radiologic technology programs was the Allied Health Education Directory (Allied Health Education Directory, 1991).

Data Collection Procedure

While the validity of a descriptive survey which utilizes a mail survey can be threatened by a low response rate, the survey was planned to mitigate against this by establishing credibility for the study through a request for the completed surveys to be returned within a two week timeframe. An introductory letter (Appendix E) accompanied the survey (Appendix D) explaining the object of the study. If the surveys were not returned within this timeframe, a follow up letter (Appendix F) and a copy of the survey were sent with a ten day deadline (Dillman, 1978). Postage paid return envelopes and the promise that all survey results were analyzed in strict confidence and also was assured.

The questionnaire was mailed in April, 1991, with a cover letter explaining the study's educational significance and the importance of their participation. In addition, a self-addressed stamped envelope was included for ease of response. The confidentiality of responses was assured in the cover letter as well as on the questionnaire. As recommended by Dillman (1978), a second cover letter and questionnaire were mailed in July, 1991, to those failing to respond to the first mailing. It was anticipated that with this double request procedure, there would be a 50 percent response rate.

Statistical Procedure

Data were obtained from a descriptive survey that sought to determine the incidence and distribution of the characteristics and opinions of community college radiologic technology program directors. The purpose of this survey was not to be scientific, but to be action and policy oriented.

Frequency distribution and descriptive statistical analysis of the data were performed including numerical tabulations, the means, standard deviation, median and frequencies. Tables were constructed to show upper and lower limits, midpoint frequencies, relative frequency, cumulative frequency, and cumulative relative frequency. Classifications were related to the opinions ratings: (0) no opinion; (1) strongly disagree; (2) disagree; (3) agree and; (4) strongly agree. Upper and lower limits were related to numerical values of .5 - 1.5 for the opinion - strongly disagree; 1.5 - 2.5 for the opinion - disagree; and 2.5 - 3.5 for the opinion - agree; and 3.5 - 4.5 for the opinion strongly agree with midpoints for each opinion being 1.0 - 4.0, respectively. Frequency was the number of individuals in use of two or more categories or classes. The data were loaded into the Student Edition of Minitab Statistical Software for analysis. According to Kerlinger's survey methodology (1979), analysis consisted of the categorizing, ordering, manipulating, and summarizing of data. These

results are presented and interpreted in the following chapter, to which attention is now directed.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The primary purpose of this study was to assess and analyze perceptions of community college radiologic technology program directors throughout the United States and their usage of selection criteria for prospective students. The perceptions and opinions were quantified in terms of the participant's responses on <u>The Survey of Recruitment</u> <u>Admission and Selection Criteria for Radiologic Technology Programs</u>, an instrument developed for this study. Due to the fact that the field of radiologic technology is considered to be a relatively young allied health profession and due to the limited research on community college radiologic technology entrance assessment and student successes, it was decided that an investigation of selection criteria related to community college radiologic technology programs would be significant. The organization of this chapter begins with an introduction, the demographics of the populations, and the results of analysis of the survey items.

Surveys were mailed to 199 public community college radiologic technology programs in the United States in 1991, according to a list provided by the Allied Health Education Directory with appropriate instructions as well as the information regarding the purpose of the study (Appendix D). There were 1,126 members of the American Association of Community Colleges in 1991, thus about one in six

institutions possessed radiologic technology programs. Only 181 public community colleges sponsoring radiologic technology programs could be said to have received the survey; 18 surveys were returned due to the fact they were undeliverable.

Use of a double mailing procedure yielded eighty (80) respondents to the survey. The gender composition of the respondents was 41 female or 51.3 percent and 39 male or 48.8 percent as shown in Table V, "Gender of Respondents to the Survey of Recruitment, Admission and Selection Criteria for Radiologic Technology Programs, by Number and Percent."

TABLE V

GENDER OF RESPONDENTS TO THE SURVEY OF RECRUITMENT, ADMISSION AND SELECTION CRITERIA FOR RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS, BY NUMBER AND PERCENT

GENDER	NUMBER	PERCENT
Female Male	41 39	51.2 48.8
Total	80	100.0

In this descriptive study, the perception of community college radiologic technology program directors were assessed and results were also reported in terms of number and percentage. Table VI, "Job Classification of Respondents to the Survey of Recruitment, Admission and Selection Criteria for Radiologic Technology Programs, by Number and Percent," indicated that 93.7 percent of the respondents classified themselves as community college radiologic technology program directors, while four (5.0 percent) were faculty and one (1.2 percent) was classified as other.

TABLE VI

JOB CLASSIFICATION OF RESPONDENTS TO THE SURVEY OF RECRUITMENT, ADMISSION AND SELECTION CRITERIA FOR RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS, BY NUMBER AND PERCENT

POSITION	NUMBER	PERCENT
Program Director Faculty Other	75 4 1	93.8 5.0 1.2
Total	80	100.0

Table VII, "Educational Level of Respondents to the Survey of Recruitment, Admission and Selection Criteria for Radiologic Technology Programs, by Number and Percent," shows that 97.5 percent of the survey respondents expressed their education level. The most commonly held degree among the respondents was the Master's degree. It is interesting to note that nearly 40 percent of the respondents held a Bachelor degree or below, which leads one to wonder whether there is a need for radiologic technologists program directors to expand their professional development to upgrade skill levels.

TABLE VII

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
DEGREE	NUMBER	PERCENT
Associate Bachelor Master Specialist Doctorate	9 22 41 3 5	11.5 28.2 52.6 1.3 6.4
Total	80	100.0

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF RESPONDENTS TO THE SURVEY OF RECRUITMENT, ADMISSION AND SELECTION CRITERIA FOR RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS, BY NUMBER AND PERCENT

Item 52 of the General Information section of the survey asked the location of your schools. Response options were:

major metropolitan area (1,000,000 or more),

- large city or metropolitan (100,000 to 1,000,000),
- town or medium city (10,000 to 99,000),
- small town or rural center (fewer than 10,000).

The majority of survey respondents were from large cities as shown by Table VIII, "Location of Community Colleges of Respondents to the Survey of Recruitment, Admission and Selection Criteria for Radiologic Technology Programs by Number and Percent. Thirty-four of the respondents or 43 percent indicated that their school of radiologic technology was located in a large city, 26 of the respondents or 33 percent indicated that their school was located in a medium-sized city, 12 of the respondents or 15 percent indicated that their school was located in a major metropolitan area, and 7 of the respondents or 8.8 percent indicated their community college radiologic technology program was located in a small town or center. According to the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), the location of the community college will determine if it is classified as suburban, urban or rural.

TABLE VIII

LOCATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES OF RESPONDENTS TO THE SURVEY OF RECRUITMENT, ADMISSION AND SELECTION CRITERIA FOR RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS BY NUMBER AND PERCENT

LOCATION	NUMBER	PERCENT
Major Metro Area Large City Medium City Small Town Non-response or omission	12 34 26 7 1	15.2 43.0 33.0 8.8 0.0
Total	80	100.0

Table IX, "American Registry of Radiologic Technologists Certification Examination First Time Pass Rate," presents data regarding the first time pass rate of the American Registry of Radiologic Technologist's (ARRT) Certification Examination. The ARRT examination total score is reported as a scaled score. The scaled score does not equal the number of questions answered correctly, nor is it the percent of the questions answered correctly. Total scores for all examinees are converted to a score ranging from 1 to 99, with a scaled score of 75 defined as passing. The number of correct answers necessary to achieve a scaled score of 75 is based upon the judgement of the Registry's advisory committee regarding what level of performance constituted a minimal passing score and based on examination of actual scores and historical data available.

TABLE IX

Class	Lower Limit	Upper Limit	Midpoint	: Frequency		
at or b	elow	76.5		0		
1	76.5	77.5	77.0	1		
2	77.5	78.5	78.0	2		
3	78.5	79.5	79.0	0		
4	79.5	80.5	80.0	6		
5	80.5	81.5	81.0	0		
6	81.5	82.5	82.0	2		
7	82.5	83.5	83.0	0		
8	83.5	84.5	84.0	2		
9	84.5	85.5	85.0	3		
10	85.5	86.5	86.0	0		
11	86.5	87.5	87.0	2		
12	87.5	88.5	88.0	6		
13	88.5	89.5	89.0	1		
14	89.5	90.5	90.0	7		
15	90.5	91.5	91.0	1		
16	91.5	92.5	92.0	5		
17	92.5	93.5	93.0	2		
18	93.5	94.5	94.0	2		
19	94.5	95.5	95.0	4		
20	95.5	96.5	96.0	2		
2 1	96.5	97.5	97.0	5		
22	97.5	98.5	98.0	6		
23	98.5	99.5	99.0	6		
24	99.5	100.5	100.0	11		
above	100.5					

AMERICAN REGISTRY OF RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGISTS CERTIFICATION EXAMINATION FIRST TIME PASS RATE, 1991

Mean = 91.9 Median = 92.5

According to Table IX, "American Registry of Radiologic Technologists Certification Examination First Time Pass Rate, 1991," the surveyed radiologic technology programs' first time pass rate of the ARRT Certification Examination had a mean of 91.9 percent and a median of 92.5 percent. This pass rate indicated 57.9 percent (n = 44) of the community college radiologic technology program students passed the ARRT Examination the first time the student took the exam with an average score of 91.9 percent. Research Question One: What cognitive and non-cognitive selection criteria are currently being used? Tables X, XI, XII and XIII address Research Question One: What cognitive and non-cognitive selection criteria are currently being used, and contains the descriptive statistical analysis of items 41 and 42 of Part II, the General Information section of the survey (Appendix D).

TABLE X

RESPONDING RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM DIRECTORS' USE OF STUDENT COGNITIVE SELECTION CRITERIA AND WEIGHTED INSTRUMENTS CURRENTLY BEING USED

	M	ETRO	LARGE		ME	MEDIUM		SMALL		TOTAL	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	
ACT	2	12.5	10	23.8	14	40.0	1	11.1	27	87.4	
AHAT			1	2.3	2	5.7			3	8.1	
AHQT			1	2.3					1	2.3	
APST			1	2.3	1	2.8			2	5.2	
APT	1	6.2	1	2.3	1				2	8.6	
ASSET	4	25.0	7	16.6	2	5.7	2	22.2	15	69.6	
CAT			1	2.3					1	2.3	
CBAP							1	11.1	1	11.1	
CBP	1	6.2							1	6.2	
CGP			1	2.3	1	2.8	3	33.3	5	38.5	
CGPE			1	2.3					1	2.3	
CPE					1	2.8			1	2.8	
CPP	1	6.2							1	6.2	
CPT					1	2.3	}		1	2.3	
ENGL					1	2.3			1	2.3	
GPA	2	12.5	1	2.3	1	2.8			4	17.7	
hgpa					1	2.8			1	2.8	
HOBE			1	2.3	1	2.8			2	5.2	
IAE			1	2.3					1	2.3	
MAPS	1	6.2							1	6.2	
MATH			1	2.3					1	2.3	
NJBS	1		1	2.3					1	2.3	
OPEN	1	6.2							1	6.2	
OWN	1	6.2							1	6.2	
PSB	f				1	2.8	1	11.1	2	13.9	
SAT	2	12.5	7	16.6	7	20.0	1	11.1	17	60.2	

	METRO No. Percent		LARGE No. Percent		MEDIUM No. Percent		SMALL No. Percent		TOTAL No. Percent	
SCHL SPT TABE TASP			1 2	2.3 4.7	1 1	2.8 2.8			1 1 1 2	2.3 2.8 2.8 4.7
TOTALS	16		39		36		9		100	

TABLE X (continued)

Note: Proper names for acronyms can be found in Appendix G.

Table X reveals that the most common cognitive selection criteria used by community college radiologic technology programs were the American College Test (87.4 percent), followed by the ACT Assessment (69.6 percent), and the Scholastic Aptitude Test (60.2 percent).

According to the descriptive statistical analysis of the responses of program directors' usage of student selection criteria and weighted instruments, it was found that rural community college radiologic technology programs relied more on ACT results than metro and large community college radiologic technology programs. It is also interesting to note that large community college radiologic technology programs had a higher reliance on the ACT Asset than rural and metro programs combined.

Table XI reveals the most common non-cognitive selection criteria used by community college radiologic technology programs were interview(s) (2.8 percent) and evaluation(s) (2.3 percent).

TABLE XI

RESPONDING RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM DIRECTORS' USE OF STUDENT NON-COGNITIVE SELECTION CRITERIA AND WEIGHTED INSTRUMENTS CURRENTLY BEING USED

	METRO		LARGE		MEDIUM		SMALL		то	TAL
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
EVAL					1	2.3			1	2.3
						4.0		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		4.0
TOTALS					2				2	

Note: Proper names for acronyms can be found in Appendix G.

Table XII reveals that the cognitive selection criteria used by responding radiologic technology program directors were college grade point average (33 percent), interview (31.5 percent), high school grade point average (31.4 percent), and course grade point average (27.1 percent).

TABLE XII

	M	ETRO	I	ARGE	ME	DIUM	SMALL		TC	TAL
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
A & P			8	4.0	1	0.7			7	4.8
ACAD	1	2.1			1	0.7			2	2.9
ACT	1		7	4.7	6	4.7			13	9.4
ACTC					1	0.7			1	0.7
ACIM	İ .				1	0.7			1	0.7
ACTR	ł				1	0.7			1	0.7
AMAT	1	2.1	1	0.8	1	0.7			3	3.6
ALGEBRA			10	6.7	2	1.5			12	8.2
APDT	Ì		2	1.3					2	1.3
APPL	1	2.1	5	3.3	1	0.7	1	3.1	8	9.4
APST	ļ.				1	0.7			1	0.7
APT			1	0.6	1	0.7	ļ		4	2.8
ASSET	1	2.1	5	3.3	1	0.7	1	3.1	8	9.4
BIOLOGY			3	2.0	1	0.7			4	2.8
CGP							2	8.2	2	8.2
CGPA	8	10.8	10	8.7	8	5.3	2	8.2	28	33.0
*CGPC							1	3.1	1	3.1
CGPR							1	3.1	1	3.1
CGPV	1				1		1	3.1	1	3.1

RESPONDING RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM DIRECTORS' OPINIONS REGARDING COGNITIVE SELECTION CRITERIA USED IN 1990-1991, BY TYPE OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE

	M		т	 א סרידי	ME					
	No.	Percent	NO.	Percent	NO.	Percent	No.	Dercent	No	Dercent
CHEMIST			5	3.3					5	3.3
CHGP]		1	0.8					1	0.6
COLLEGE			1	0.8					1	0.6
COMP	ļ				2	1.8			2	1.5
CPC			1	0.8					1	0.5
CPT					1	0.7			1	0.7
CRED					1	0.7			1	0.7
DEGREE	1	2.1	3	2.0	1	0.7			5	4.9
DMD					1	0.7			1	0.6
DOMI	1	2.1							1	2.1
ENGL			3	2.0	4	3.1			7	5.1
EXPR	2	4.3	2	1.3	2	1.5	1	3.1	7	10.3
GED	1	2.1	1	0.8	1	0.7	1	3.1	4	8.7
GEOM			1	0.8					1	0.6
GNED	1	2.1	4	2.8	5	3.9			10	8.8
*GPA	8	13.0	7	4.7	8	6.3	1	3.1	24	27.1
GPC					1	0.7			1	0.7
*HGPA	5	10.8	11	7.3	13	10.2	1	3.1	30	31.4
HLEX					1	0.7			1	0.7
HS			2	1.3	2	1.5			6	9.1
HSA					2	1.5			2	1.5
HSBI			3	2.0					3	2.0
HSCM			1	0.8					1	0.8
HSMT			1	0.8					1	0.8
HSRANK			1	0.8	3	2.3			4	3.0
HSB					2	1.5			2	1.5
MAPS			1	0.8	_				1	0.8
MATH	2	4.3	5	3.3	4	3.1	3	9.3	14	20.2
MDTM			1	0.8	_				1	0.8
NTBS			_				1	3.1	1	3.1
ORNT		:	1	0.8					1	0.8
PHC			1	0.8	1	0.7			2	1.4
PREO	4	8.7	1	0.8	-		1	3.1	8	12.4
PROF	-	•••	_		1	0.7	-	- · -	1	0.7
PSB						0.7	1	3.1	2	3.9
OWE					1	0.7	-	•	1	0.7
READ			1	0.8	-				Ī	0.8
REME			_				1	3.1	1	3.1
SAT			3	2.0	2	1.5	_		5	3.5
SAT	2	4.3	7	4.7	7	5.5	1	3.1	17	17.6
SCNC	1	2.1	7	4.7	3	2.3	4	12.5	15	21.7
SCNS	-				1	0.7	-		1	0.7
SKET	1	2.1			_				1	2.1
SKILL	1	2.1							1	2. 1
WOR	_				1	0.7			1 1	0.7
WRITING	1	2.1							1	2.1
TOTALS	43		125		99		25		317	
	l		[I.,	·····	L		L	

TABLE XII (continued)

Note: Proper names for acronyms can be found in Appendix G.

Table XIII reveals that non-cognitive selection criteria used by responding radiologic technology program directors were interview(s) (31.5 percent), hospital visitations (12.6 percent) and references (5.0 percent).

According to the descriptive statistical analysis of the responses of program directors opinions regarding selection criteria used in 1990-1991, it was found that Metro community college radiologic technology programs relied more on college grade point, interview, high school grade point and grade point average, then the other types of community colleges. The medium community college radiologic technology program came within .6 percentage points of Metro community college radiologic technology programs in the usage of high school grade point average and interview as selection criteria used in 1990-1991.

TABLE XIII

	METRO		LARGE		MEDIUM		SMALL		т)TAL
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
FILE				· ·····	1	0.7			1	0.7
GOAL			ļ		2	1.5			2	1.5
*INIV	5	10.8	12	8.0	13	10.2	4	2.5	34	31.5
PBK					1	0.7			1	0.7
PHYS			8	4.0	1	0.7			7	4.8
PICR			ļ		1	0.7			1	0.7
RECM	ł						1	3.1	1	3.1
REFR	-		4	2.6	3	2.3			7	5.0
RESD	ł				1	0.7			1	0.7
VISIT	2	4.3	3	2.0	4	3.1	1	3.1	10	12.6
WORKEXP	1	2.1	1	0.8					2	2.8
TOTALS	8		28	<u></u>	27		6		67	

RESPONDING RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM DIRECTORS' OPINIONS REGARDING NON-COGNITIVE SELECTION CRITERIA USED IN 1990-1991, BY TYPE OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Note: Proper names for acronyms can be found in Appendix G.

Cognitive and Non-Cognitive Selection Criteria

Attention is now turned to Question Two: What are the opinions regarding the selection criteria that are used now? Table XIV, "Responding Radiologic Technology Program Directors' Opinions Regarding Cognitive Student Selection Criteria Currently Being Used Now, addresses the opinions of community college radiologic technology program director's regarding the selection criteria that are being used now and contains descriptive statistical analysis of specific item numbers found in Part I: Opinion Rating of the survey (Appendix D).

TABLE XIV

RESPONDING RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM DIRECTORS' OPINIONS REGARDING COGNITIVE STUDENT SELECTION CRITERIA BEING USED NOW

In your opinion	No Opinion O No. (%)	Strongly <u>Disagree</u> 1 No. (%)	Disagree 2 No. (%)	Agree 3 No. (%)	Strongly <u>Agree</u> 4 No. (%)
(1) there is a correlation between a student's pre- admission ACT composite score and the student's score on the post graduate certifi- cate exam sponsored by the ARRT.	on re 0 (0)	3 (6.2)	14 (29.1)	27 (56.2)	4 (8.3)
(2) there is a correlative between a student's pre-admission individual selection scores on the ACT and the ARRT examination.	on 0 (0)	2 (4.5)	14 (31.8)	25 (56.2)	3 (6.8)
(3) there is a significar relationship between grade in high school science subjects and radiography curriculum counterparts.	nt 0 (0)	4 (5.2)	16 (21.0)	48 (63.1)	8 (10.5)

	No <u>Opinion</u> 0 No.	Strongly <u>Disagree</u> 1 No.	Disagree 2	<u>Agree</u> 3	Strongly Agree 4
In your opinion	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
(6) the ACT is a valid predictor of college grades for students from low socioeconomic background.	5 0 (0)	10 (20.8)	20 (41.6)	16 (33.3)	2 (4.1)
(10) a student's ACT sco combined with either HSGPA or high school ranking are highly predictive of	Dres				
radiologic technology program success.	0 (0)	3 (4.4)	20 (29.4)	37 (54.4)	8 (11.7)
(11) ACT results are use ful in counseling and guiding students.	9- 0 (0)	4 (6.2)	7 (10.9)	42 (65.6)	11 (17.1)
(12) the use of GPA as the only admission criteria limits admissions to only academic achievers and excludes others with less academic ability.	0 (0)	3 (3.8)	8 (10.2)	45 (51.6)	22 (28.2)
(13) using the prediction of GPA as the only admission criteria excludes students with less academic ability but possibly great skills in leadership.	n 0 (0)	2 (2.6)	11 (14.6)	42 (56.0)	20 (26.6)
(15) HSGPA combined with aptitude tests are more effective predictors of college grades than either one along.	0 (0)	2 (2.7)	10 (13.5)	44 (59.4)	18 (24.3)
(17) are current radio- logic technology programs, courses, policies, and procedures appropriate for adult learners.	0 (0)	2 (2.5)	14 (17.7)	49 (62.0)	14 (17.1)

In your opinion	No <u>Opinion</u> O No. (%)	Strongly <u>Disagree</u> 1 No. (%)	Disagree 2 No. (%)	<u>Agree</u> 3 No. (%)	Strongly <u>Agree</u> 4 No. (%)
(20) traditional admissi criteria, previous academic performance and aptitude tests, have excluded large numbers of individuals, many of whom who had the motivation and the personality characteristics necessary to succeed.	on 2 3 6 0 (0)	4 (5.6)	25 (35.2)	35 (49.2)	7 (9.8)
(23) the goals and object ives of the radiologic technology program and the sponsoring institution <u>should be related</u> to cultivation of accepted applicant competencies so that an effective entry- level radiographer is a product of the two.	rt 0 (0)	1 (1.5)	4 (6.0)	43 (65.1)	18 (27.2)

Respondents agreed generally that cognitive selection criteria is being used to select prospective applicants and to predict their success. Table XIV addresses item 1, where 64.4 percent (n = 31) of community college radiologic technology program directors agreed to strongly agreed that there is a correlation between a student's pre-admission American College Testing composite score and the student's score on the post graduate American Registry of Radiologic Technologists examination. However, of the total respondents, 32 did not express an opinion. The mean response had a value of 2.66 (s = 0.724) implied that the average respondent to this item agreed with item number 1. This conclusion is strengthened by the median value of 3. In the opinion of the responding radiologic technology program directors, there is a correlation between a student's pre-admission American College Testing (ACT) Composite Score and the student's score on the post-graduate Registry Examination.

Table XIV also shows the correlation between a student's sub-test scores on the ACT and the Registry Examination. Sixty-three point six percent (n = 28) agreed to strongly agreed that there is a correlation between a student's pre-admission individual section scores on the ACT and the Registry Examination, with only 44 respondents, or 55.0 percent, addressed this item. The range of scores for the Registry examination is a low of/and a range of 99, according to the ARRT officials. The reliability of the ARRT examination varies from test date to test date, but the Kuder-Richardson (KR20) is reported to be in the range of .92 to .94 for the ARRT examinations given between 1979 and 1986. The Kuder-Richardson formula 20, a type of reliability coefficient, provides relatively conservative estimates of the coefficient of equivalence. In terms of test theory, the coefficient of equivalence is the most desirable index of test reliability, since it involves two different representative samples of items. Validity of the Registry examination is determined by content validity, and a numerical value for predictive validity is not calculated for the examination (Francis, 1990). This was item number 2 in the survey.

The correlation between grades in high school science subject(s) and radiography curriculum counterparts is also presented in Table XIV, item number 3 of the survey, where 73.3 percent (n = 56) of the respondents agreed to strongly agreed that there is a significant relationship between grades in high school science subject(s) and radiography curriculum counterparts. Of the total respondents, 4 did not express an

opinion. The mean response had a value of 2.78 (s = 0.698) which implied the average respondent to this item agreed with item number 3. This conclusion is strengthened by the median value of 3. This conclusion was also reached in Kavanaugh's study of selected high school courses and their relation to grades in selected courses in the radiography curriculum (Kavanaugh, 1981).

Table XIV also addresses item number 6 of the survey, where 37.5 percent (n = 18) of respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that the American College Test is a valid predictor of college grades for students from low socioeconomic backgrounds. Only 48 (60 percent) of the total respondents to the survey addressed this item with a mean value of 2.20 (s = 0.82) and a median value of 2. Forty percent (n = 20) of the respondents disagreed with the statement that the ACT is a valid predictor of college grades for students from low socioeconomic backgrounds.

Table XIV addresses item number 10 of the survey, where 66.1 percent (n = 45) of respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that a student's ACT scores combined with either high school grade point average or high school ranking are highly predictive of radiologic technology program success. Sixty-eight (85 percent) of the total respondents to the survey addressed this item. This same perspective was also reached by Ferguson (1979), who found that when the ACT scores were combined with either high school grade point averages or high school rank, the results were highly predictive of college success.

Table XIV addresses item number 11 of the survey, where 83 percent (n = 53) of the respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that ACT results are useful in counseling and guiding students. Of the total respondents, 16 did not express an opinion.

Table XIV addresses item number 12 of the survey, where 76 percent (n = 67) of respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that the use of grade point average as the only admission criteria limits admissions to only academic achievers and excludes others with less academic ability. Seventy-eight (97.5 percent) of the total respondents to the survey addressed this item. Academic achievers are those students who have, because of previous academic performance and achievement on aptitude tests, been academically successful.

Table XIV identifies item number 13 of the survey, which is the correlation between grade point averages and leadership skills. Of the respondents to this item, 82.7 percent (n = 62) of the respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that using the prediction of grade point average as the only admission criteria excludes students with less academic ability but possibly greater skills in leadership. Of the total respondents, 5 did not express an opinion. The mean response had a value of 3.06 (s = 0.722) which implied the average respondent to this item agreed with item number 13. This conclusion is strengthened by the median value of 3. Grade point average has been shown to be highly predictive of grade point average in medical school courses (cognitive traits) but hold little relationship to grade point average in clinical coursework or subsequent performance in non-cognitive work settings (Murden, et al, 1978). Analysis of these findings seem to indicate that while those who select radiography as a career appear to have identifiable personality types, these types are not related to previous performance in academic courses.

In item 15 of Table XIV, 83.8 percent (n = 62) of the respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that high school grade point average combined with aptitude tests are more effective predictors of radiologic

technology students' grades in college grades than either one alone. Of the total respondents, 6 did not express an opinion. The mean response had a value of 3.054 (s = 0.700) which implied that the average respondent to this item agreed with item number 15. This conclusion is strengthened by the median value of 3.

Table XIV identifies item number 17 of the survey, which dealt with opinions concerning the appropriateness of courses, policies and procedures for adult learners. Of the respondents to this item, 79.8 percent (n = 63) agreed to strongly agreed that current radiologic technology programs, courses, policies and procedures are appropriate for adult learners. Of the total respondents, one did not express an opinion. The mean response had a value of 2.94 (s = 0.677) which implied that the average respondent to this item agreed with item number 17. This conclusion is strengthened by the median value of 3.

Table XII addresses item number 20 of the survey, where 59.2 percent (n = 42) of respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that traditional admissions criteria, previous academic performance, and aptitude tests have excluded large numbers of individuals, many of whom had the motivation and the personality characteristics necessary to succeed. Seventy-one (88.7 percent) of the total respondents to the survey addressed this item with a mean of 2.63 (s = 0.741) and a median value of 3. The respondents agreed that traditional admission criteria, previous academic performance and aptitude tests have excluded large numbers of individuals, many of whom had motivation and the personality characteristics have excluded large numbers of individuals, many of whom had motivation and the personality characteristics necessary to succeed.

Table XIV identifies item number 23 of the survey, where 92.4 percent (n = 61) of the respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that "the goals and objectives of radiologic technology programs

and the sponsoring institutions should be related to the cultivation of accepted applicant competencies so that an effective entry-level radiographer is the product of the two." Of the total respondents, 14 did not express an opinion. The mean response had a value of 3.18 (s = 0.605) which implied that the average respondent to this item agreed with item number 23. This conclusion is strengthened by the median value of 3. Therefore, the goals and objectives of community college radiologic technology programs and the sponsoring institutions (community colleges) should be related to knowledge, attitudes, skills and habits needed to be an effective entry level radiologic technology student. This is also emphasized in the <u>Essentials and Guidelines of an Accredited Educational</u> Program for the Radiographer (Appendix A).

Table XV, "Responding Radiologic Technology Program Directors' Opinions Regarding Non-Cognitive Student Selection Criteria Being Used Now," addresses the opinions of community college radiologic technology program directors regarding the selection criteria that are being used now and contains descriptive statistical analysis of specific item numbers found in Part I: Opinion Rating of the Survey (Appendix D).

TABLE XV

RESPONDING RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM DIRECTORS' OPINIONS REGARDING NON-COGNITIVE STUDENT SELECTION CRITERIA <u>BEING USED NOW</u>

In your opinion	No <u>Opinion</u> O No. (%)	Strongly <u>Disagree</u> 1 No. (%)	Disagree 2 No. (%)	<u>Agree</u> 3 No. (%)	Strongly <u>Agree</u> 4 No. (%)
(21) there is a relation ship between age, length of experience in an allied health setting prior to entry into a radiologic technology program, and academic success.	0 (0)	13 (3.8)	12 (18.3)	45 (57.6)	18 (23.0)

Table XV addresses item number 21 of the survey, where 81 percent (n = 63) of the respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that there is a relationship between age, length of experience in an allied setting prior to entry into a radiology technology program and academic success. Of the total respondents, 2 did not express an opinion. The mean response had a value of 3 (s = 0.738) which implied that the average respondent to this item agreed with item number 21. This conclusion is strengthened by the median value of 3.

Table XVI, "Responding Radiologic Technology Program Directors' Opinions Regarding What Cognitive Criteria Should Be Used and How Should Such Criteria Be Used" addresses Research Question Three: What cognitive and non-cognitive criteria should be used, and how should such criteria be used?

TABLE XVI

RESPONDING RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM DIRECTORS' OPINIONS REGARDING WHAT COGNITIVE CRITERIA <u>SHOULD BE USED</u> AND HOW SHOULD SUCH CRITERIA BE USED

In your opinion	No <u>Opinion</u> 0 No. (%)	Strongly <u>Disagree</u> 1 No. (%)	Disagree 2 No. (%)	Agree 3 No. (%)	Strongly <u>Agree</u> 4 No. (%)	
(4) high school grade point averages (HSGPA), algebra grades and biology grades be used in the selec- tion of students for radio- logic technology programs.	- 0 (0)	9 (11.7)	18 (23.4)	33 (42.9)	17 (22.1)	
(5) high school grade point averages (HSGPA) or grades in algebra or biology can be used to predict pass of the American Registry of Radiologic Technologist's Examination.	y ing 0 (0)	13 (17.8)	35 (47.9)	22 (30.1)	3 (4.1)	
	No <u>Opinion</u> O	Strongly <u>Disagree</u> 1	<u>Disagree</u> 2	S <u>Agree</u> 3	rongly gree 4	
--	----------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------	---------------------	--
In your opinion	No. (%)	No. (%)	No. (%)	No. (%)	No. (%)	
(7) ACT assessment shou be used to decide a studer admission into a radiologi technology program.	uld ut's .c 0 (0)	12 (19.3)	22 (35.4)	24 (38.7)	4 (6.4)	
(8) ACT results should used to reject radiologic technology student applicants.	be 0 (0)	17 (26.9)	31 (49.2)	14 (22.2)	1 (1.5)	
(9) ACT scores or SAT scores and high school rank should be used as admission criteria.	0 (0)	9 (13.2)	26 (38.2)	29 (42.6)	4 (5.8)	
(16) should standardize admission's criteria be <u>ranked or weighted</u> so that students with the highest accumulated score be admitted to radiologic technology programs.	d 0 (0)	5 (6.4)	17 (21.7)	39 (50.0)	17 (21.7)	
(22) cognitive, affecti and psychomotor domains of students should be weighte and used in selecting radiologic technology students.	ve, d (0)	5 (6.4)	15 (19.4)	49 (63.6)	8 (10.3)	
(24) valid and reliable behavior instruments shoul be used in the admissions process to radiologic technology programs.	d 0 (0)	1 (1.4)	13 (18.5)	45 (64.2)	11 (15.7)	
(26) <u>a legal review of</u> <u>selection policies</u> dealing with uniformity, as well a exceptions to such uniformity should be done every three years.	s 0 (0)	4 (5.5)	7 (9.7)	44 (61.1)	17 (23.6)	

,

TABLE XVI (continued)

<u>(</u>	No Dpinion 0	Strongly <u>Disagree</u> 1	Disagree 2	Agree A	trongly Agree 4
In your opinion	No. (%)	- No. (%)	 No. (१)	No. (१)	• No. (१)
(27) a radiologic technology program should use the same admissions process for all applicants.)- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	0 (0)	1 (1.2)	27 (34.1)	51 (64.5)
(28) applicants should b provided an opportunity to show that certain criteria may be inappropriate for evaluating their qualifi- cations.	e 0 (0)	6 (8.0)	24 (32.0)	40 (53.3)	5 (6.6)
(29) considerable flexi bility might have to be inc porated into radiologic tec nology student selection to attract individuals from under-represented groups in the applicant pool.	- or- h- 0 (0)	8 (10.3)	31 (40.26)	32 (41.5)	6 (7.7)
(30) a program should describe its admission's criteria publicly so that potential applicants can obtain a reasonable estimate of their likelihood of meeting such standards.	e 0 (0)	1 (1.2)	2 (2.5)	22 (27.5)	55 (68.7)
(31) rejected applicants should be given a statement of reasons for their rejection and a means of appeal if they want to challenge the explanation.	0 (0)	2 (2.6)	16 (21.3)	34 (45.3)	23 (30.6)
(32) all those who parti- cipate in student selection should be instructed and competent in the process of multiple domain evaluation of radiologic technology applicants.	- 0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (9.8)	49 (69.0)	15 (21.1)

TABLE XVI (continued)

Or	No Dinion	o Strongly Lon <u>Disagree</u> <u>Disagree</u>		Strongly <u>Agree</u> <u>Agree</u>		
In your opinion	0 No. (%)	1 No. (%)	2 No. (%)	3 No. (%)	4 No. (१)	
(35) research is essentia to determine the relative importance of inappropriate selection process.	al 0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (6.7)	50 (67.5)	19 (25.68)	
(37) information network should be established to permit exchange of recruit- ment and selection policies in radiologic technology education.	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (9.5)	45 (61.6)	21 (28.7)	
(38) radiologic technolog programs should deemphasize technical and scientific training in favor of emphasi on the social sciences, the humanities, and training or problem solving skills.	лу .s (0)	14 (18.9	42) (56.7)	13 (17.5)	5 (6.7)	
(39) radiologic technolog programs should give more emphasis on training in scholastic skills such as writing and critical thinkin as well as afford opportu- nities for the development of suitable values.	0 0 12 0 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13	3 (3.9)	13 (16.8)	50 (64.9)	11 (14.2)	
(40) the current focus on scientific knowledge in radiologic technology admission decisions should be modified to allow for more emphasis in student's abilities to learn indepen- dently and acquire analytic skills and values appropriat to the field of radiologic technology	ze 0 (0)	0	17	48	7	
skills and values appropriat to the field of radiologic technology.	æ 0 (0)	0 (0)	17 (23.6)	48 (66.6)	7 (9.7)	

Table XVI addresses whether high school grade point averages, algebra grades and biology grades should be used in the selection of radiologic technology students. Sixty-five percent (n = 50) of respondents to the item agreed to strongly agreed that high school grade point averages, algebra grades and biology grades should be used in the selection of students for radiologic technology programs. Seventy-seven (96.2 percent) of the community college radiologic technology program directors responding to the survey addressed this item number 4 of the survey. With a mean value of 2.75 (s = 0.93) and a median value of 3, the respondents agreed that high school grade point averages, algebra grades and biology grades should be used in the selection of radiologic technology students.

The perceived correlation between high school grade point averages, algebra and biology grades used to predict passing the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists is item 5 presented in Table XVI. Thirty-four point two percent (n = 25) of the respondents to item 5 of the survey agreed to strongly agreed that high school grade point averages or grades in algebra or biology can be used to predict passing of the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists (ARRT) Examination. Sixty-five point seven percent (n = 48) of the respondents to item 5 of the survey disagreed to strongly disagreed that high school grade point averages or grades in algebra or biology can be used to predict passing of the Registry Examination. Of the total respondents, seven did not express an opinion. The mean response had a value of 2.20 (s = 0.78) which implied that the average respondent to this item disagreed with item number 5. This conclusion is strengthened by the median value of 2.

Table XVI addresses item number 7 of the survey, where 45.1 percent

(n = 28) of the respondents to this item agreed that American College Test asset which involves Reading, English, Math and Science Reasoning should be used to decide a student's admission into a radiologic technology program. Of the total respondents, 18 did not express an opinion. The mean response had a value of 2.32 (s = 0.86) which implied that the average respondent to this item agreed with item number 7. Thirty-five percent (n = 27) disagreed with item 7. This conclusion is strengthened by the median value of 2.

Table XVI addresses item number 8 of the survey, where 24 percent (n = 15) of the respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that American College Test (ACT) results should be used to reject radiologic technology student applicants. Only 63 (78.7 percent) of the total respondents to the survey addressed this item. Forty-nine percent of the respondents disagreed that ACT results should be used to reject radiologic technology student applicants. This conclusion is supported by a mean value of 1.98 (s = 0.75) and a median value of 2.

Table XVI also addresses item number 9 of the survey, where 49 percent (n = 33) of the respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that American College Test or Scholastic Aptitude Test scores and high school rank should be used as admission criteria. Of the total respondents, 12 did not express an opinion. The mean response had a value of 2.41 (s = 0.796) which implied that the average respondent to this item agreed with item number 9. Thirty-eight percent (n = 26) of the respondents disagreed with item 9. This conclusion is strengthened by the median value of 2. The fact that thirty-eight percent of the respondents disagreed implies that a significant percentage of the nation's community college radiologic technology program directors have problems and concerns with standardized tests. Table XVI addresses item number 16 of the survey, where 71.8 percent (n = 56) of respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that standardized admission's criteria should be ranked or weighted, so that students with the highest accumulated score should be admitted to community college radiologic technology programs. Seventy-eight (97.5 percent) of the total respondents to the survey addressed this item. With a mean value of 2.87 (s = 0.827) and a median value of 3, the respondents agreed that standardized admission's criteria should be ranked or weighted, so that students with the highest accumulated score be admitted to community college radiologic technology programs.

The respondents were asked to check which weighted instruments were used as part of their selection criteria. This general information item will be found in question 41 of the survey. The respondents were not asked which instrument should get the most weight.

Table XVI addresses item number 22 of the survey, where 74.0 percent (n = 57) of respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that cognitive and non-cognitive domains of students should be weighted and used in selecting radiologic technology students. Seventy-seven (96.2 percent) of the total respondents to the survey addressed this item with a mean value of 2.77 (s = 0.718) and a median of 3. The respondents, thus agreed to strongly agreed that cognitive and non-cognitive domains of students should be weighted and used in selecting radiologic technology students.

Table XVI addresses item number 24 of the survey, where 80 percent (n = 56) of respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that valid and reliable behavior measurements should be used in the admission's process to radiologic technology programs. Seventy (87.5 percent) of the total respondents to the survey addressed this item

106

with a mean value of 2.94 (s = 0.634) and a median value of 3. The respondents agreed that valid and reliable behavior measurements should be used in the admissions process to radiologic technology programs.

Table XVI addresses item 26 of the survey, where 84.7 percent (n = 61) of respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that there should be a legal review of selection policies dealing with uniformity while exceptions to such uniformity should be done every three years. The mean response had a value of 3.02 (s = 0.750), which implied that the average respondent to this item agreed with item 26. The conclusion is strengthened by the median of 3. Therefore, it appears there is strong support for a legal review of selection criteria and policies should be done every three years with uniformity among community college radiologic technology program directors.

Table XVI addresses item number 27 of the survey, where 98.7 percent (n = 78) of the respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that a radiologic technology program should use the same admissions process for all applicants. Of the total respondents, one did not express an opinion. The mean response had a value of 3.63 (s = 0.510) which implied that the average respondent to this item agreed with item number 27. The conclusion is strengthened by the median value of 4. The fact that the respondents agreed to strongly agreed to item number 27 supports the respondents' agreements to uniformity and legal review of selection criteria found in item number 26.

Table XVI addresses item number 28 of the survey, where 56.2 percent (n = 45) of respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that applicants should be provided an opportunity to show that certain criteria may be inappropriate for evaluating their qualifications. Seventy-five (93.7 percent) of the total respondents to the survey

addressed this item with a mean value of 2.58 (s = 0.736) and a median value of 3. The respondents agreed that applicants should be provided an opportunity to show that certain criteria may be inappropriate for evaluating their qualifications. This also likely indicates commitment to the traditional open door policy on part of the respondents.

Table XVI addresses item number 29 of the survey, where 49.3 percent (n = 38) of the respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that "considerable flexibility might have to be incorporated into radiologic technology student selection to attract individuals from minority groups in the applicant pool." Of the total respondents, 5 did not express an opinion. The mean response had a value of 2.46 (s = 0.787) which implied that the average respondent to this item generally agreed. Forty percent (n = 31) of the respondents disagreed with item 29. This conclusion is strengthened by the median of 2. Some of the respondents to item number 29, therefore, indicated that uniformity in selection should exist for all applicants to community college radiologic technology programs whereas some respondents felt that considerable flexibility be incorporated into student selection to accommodate the minority applicant pool. This reflects a lack of uncertainty by community college radiologic technology program directors as to what to incorporate into radiologic technology selection criteria that would not distract or eliminate minority groups from the applicant pool.

Table XVI addresses item number 30 of the survey, where 96.2 percent (n = 77) of respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that "a program should describe its admission's criteria publicly so that potential applicants can obtain a reasonable estimate of their likelihood of meeting such standards." Eighty (100 percent) of the total respondents to the survey addressed this item. With a mean value of 3.63 (s = 0.600) and a median value of 4, the respondents agreed a program should describe its admissions criteria publicly so that potential applicants can obtain a reasonable estimate of their likelihood of meeting such standards.

Table XVI identifies item number 31 of the survey, where 76 percent (n = 57) of the respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that rejected applicants should be given a statement of reasons for their rejection and a means of appeal if they wish to challenge the explanation. Thirty-three point nine percent (n = 18) disagreed to strongly disagreed that rejected applicants should be given a statement of reasons for their rejection and a means of appeal if they wish to challenge the explanation. Of the total respondents, 5 did not express an opinion. The mean response had a value of 3.04 (s = 0.795) which implied that the average respondents to this item agreed with item number 31. This conclusion is strengthened by the median value of 3. Thus, the majority of community college radiologic technology program directors believed that if applicants are not selected, a statement of reasons for their rejection should be given along with a means of appeal if they want to challenge the rejection. This indicates that most program directors are aware of Essential V.A.7 which states "appropriate due process and appeal mechanisms shall be available and made known to all students." (Essentials, 1991).

Table XVI addresses item number 32 of the survey, where 90.1 percent (n = 64) of respondents to this item agreed or strongly agreed that all those who participate in student selection should be instructed and competent in the process of multiple domain evaluation of radiologic technology student applicants. Seventy-one (88.7 percent) of the total respondents to the survey addressed this item. With a mean value of

3.11 (s = 0.549) and a median value of 3, the respondents agreed that all those who participate in student selection should be instructed and competent in the process of multiple domain evaluation of radiologic technology applicants. Multiple domain evaluation is defined here to mean incorporating the understanding of the cognitive and non-cognitive behavioral domains. By drawing on the educational expertise and materials of peers, academic institutes, professional organizations and government, there shall be an assurance that information pertaining to allied health especially, radiologic technology, is current, authentic, unbiased and educational. Information networks are becoming more and more important in the area of technical education especially in the fields related to allied health. Programs have a responsibility to produce graduates with an appropriate mix of cognitive, affective, and psychomotor skills (Essentials, 1991).

Table XVI addresses item number 35 of the survey, where 92.3 percent (n = 69) of the respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that research is essential to determine the relative importance of appropriate as well as inappropriate selection processes. Of the total respondents, 6 did not express an opinion. The mean response had a value of 3.18 (s = 0.540) which implied that the average respondent to this item agreed with item number 35. This conclusion is strengthened by the median value of 3. If community college radiologic technology programs are to maintain integrity, research is essential to determine the relative importance of inappropriate selection processes.

Table XVI addresses item number 37 of the survey, where 93.3 percent (n = 66) of the respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that information networks should be established to permit change of recruitment and selection policies in radiologic technology education.

110

Of the total respondents, 7 did not express an opinion. The mean response had a value of 3.19 (s = 0.892) which implied that the average respondent to this item agreed with item number 37. This conclusion is strengthened by a median value of 3. Although we can make certain generalizations about students and how they learn, the rate at which they learn, and the interested that they manifest, learning is for each person a highly individual process. Students are very much a product of their learning experience(s). Therefore, program directors who participate in student selection must consider this and be aware of the cognitive and non-cognitive domain criteria that are used in the student selection process.

Table XVI addresses item number 38 of the survey, where 23.3 percent (n = 18) of respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that radiologic technology programs should deemphasize technical and scientific training in favor of emphasis on the social sciences, the humanities, and training in thinking or problem solving skills. Seventy-five point six percent (n = 56) disagreed or strongly disagreed that radiologic technology programs should deemphasize technical and scientific training in favor of emphasis on the social sciences, the humanities, and training in thinking or problem solving skills. Of the total respondents, 6 did not express an opinion. The mean response had a value of 2.12 which implied that the average respondent to this item disagreed with item number 38. This conclusion is strengthened by a median value of 2. The response to this item indicates that in the program directors opinion, technical and scientific training should be employed over social sciences, humanities, and training in thinking or problem-solving. The concern here is that failure to identify a persons basic needs or to make a decision could undermine ones ability to

respond to allied health service needs and demands. Attention is now turned to a comparison of a sample of non-respondents (18) to respondents (80).

Table XVI addresses item number 39 of the survey, where 79.3 percent (n = 61) of the respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that radiologic technology programs should give more emphasis on training in scholastic skills such as writing and critical thinking as well as afford opportunities for the development of suitable values. Of the total respondents, 3 did not express an opinion. The mean response had a value of 2.89 (s = 0.680) which implied that the average respondent to this item agreed with item number 39. This conclusion is strengthened by the median value of 3. This indicates that there exists a need to teach critical thinking skills.

Table XVI addresses item number 40 of the survey, where 76.4 percent (n = 55) of respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that the current focus on scientific knowledge in radiologic technology admission decisions should be modified to allow for greater emphasis on a student's ability to learn independently and acquire analytic skills and values appropriate to the field of radiologic technology. Seventy-two (90 percent) of the total respondents to the survey addressed this item with a mean value of 2.86 (s = 0.564) and a median value of 3. The respondents agreed that current focus on scientific knowledge in radiologic technology admission decisions should be modified to allow for more emphasis in student's abilities to learn independently and acquire analytic skills and values appropriate to radiologic technology.

Table XVII, "Responding Radiologic Technology Program Directors' Opinions Regarding What Non-Cognitive Criteria <u>Should Be Used</u> and How Should Such Criteria be Used in Student Selection," addresses opinions of what non-cognitive criteria should be used and how should such

criteria be used in student selection.

TABLE XVII

RESPONDING RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM DIRECTORS' OPINIONS REGARDING WHAT NON-COGNITIVE CRITERIA <u>SHOULD BE USED</u> AND HOW SHOULD SUCH CRITERIA BE USED IN STUDENT SELECTION

	No <u>Opinion</u> 0 No. No.	Strongly <u>Disagree</u> 1 No.	Disagree 2 No.	<u>Agree</u> 3 No.	Strongly <u>Agree</u> 4
In your opinion	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
(14) predictors of student success must be chosen which are appropriate the goals of the radiologic technology program.	e to 0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1.3)	36 (47.3)	39 (51.3)
(18) should students, facts and impressions obtain by the interviewer be correlated to the academic/ clinical situations, <u>to</u> <u>predict a student's success</u> <u>in radiologic technology</u> .	ned 0 (0)	3 (4.3)	20 (28.9)	33 (47.8)	13 (18.8)
(19) information obtained in a student interview enable the interviewer to assess an applicant's vocabulary and ability to be concise and explicit in conveying thoughts.	d les n 0 (0)	2 (2.6)	15 (19.4)	49 (63.6)	11 (14.6)
(25) an array of relevant criteria should be used to assure applicant equity.	t 0 (0)	2 (2.6)	3 (3.9)	47 (61.0)	25 (32.4)

	No <u>Opinion</u> 0 No.	Strongly <u>Disagree</u> 1 No.	<u>Disagree</u> 2 No.	<u>Agree</u> 3 No.	Strongly <u>Agree</u> 4
In your opinion	(%)	(%)	(१)	(%)	(१)
(33) an <u>internal audit</u> should be done in the form of selection evaluation as well as external screening of the selection policies and procedures to assure consumer and					

governmental funding

agencies that the admission

process has been actually implemented according to stated protocols should be done each year.	0 (0)	6 (8.3)	21 (29.1)	35 (48.6)	10 (13.8)
(34) foresight is critical in the student selection process if radiologic technology programs are to survive the challenge of declining number of college-age applicant's in the 1990's.	0 (0)	3 (3.9)	3 (3.9)	57 (75.0)	13 (17.1)
(36) effective recruitment strategies must be coupled with rationale, humane and equitable selection policies.	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1.3)	43 (55.8)	33 (42.8)

Table XVII addresses item number 14 of the survey, where 98.7 percent (n = 75) of respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that predictors of student success must be chosen which are appropriate to the goals of the radiologic technology program. Seventy-six (95 percent) of the total respondents to the survey addressed this item. With a mean value of 3.5 (s = 0.529) and a median value of 4, the respondents agreed that predictors of student success must be chosen

114

which are appropriate to the goals of the radiologic technology program.

Table XVII addresses item number 18 of the survey, where 66.6 percent (n = 46) of the respondents to the item agreed to strongly agreed that students, facts and impressions obtained by the interviewer should be correlated to the academic/clinical situations to predict a student's success in radiologic technology. Sixty-nine (86.2 percent) of the total respondents to the survey addressed this item with a mean value of 2.81 (s = 0.791) and a median value of 3. This means that the respondents agreed that students, facts and impressions should be obtained by the interviewer and correlated to the academic/clinical settings to predict a student's success in radiologic technology.

Table XVII identifies item number 19 of the survey, where 78 percent (n = 60) of the respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that information obtained in a student's interview enables the interviewer to assess an applicant's vocabulary and ability to be concise and explicit in conveying thoughts. Of the respondents, three did not express an opinion. The mean response had a value of 2.89 (s = 0.660) which implied that the average respondent to this item agreed with number 19. This conclusion is strengthened by the median value of 3. Therefore, it appears that survey respondents believe that information obtained in a student's interview can enable the interviewer to assess the affective behavioral domain of the applicant.

Table XVII addresses item number 25 of the survey, where 93.5 percent (n = 72) of the respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that an array of relevant criteria should be used to assure applicant equity. Of the total respondents, 3 did not express an opinion. The mean response had a value of 3.23 (s = 0.646) which implied that the average respondents to this item agreed with item

number 25. This conclusion is strengthened by the median value of 3. Therefore, cognitive as well as non-cognitive selection criteria should be used so that all applicants will be evaluated equally, whether the applicant is traditional or non-traditional in student status.

Table XVII addresses item number 33 of the survey, where 61.5 percent (n = 45) of the respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that "an internal audit should be done in the form of selection evaluation as well as external screening of the selection policies and procedures to assure consumers and governmental funding agencies that the admission's process has been actually implemented according to stated protocols and that this internal audit should be done each year." Of the total respondents, 8 did not express an opinion. The mean response had a value of 2.68 (s = 0.819) which implied that the average respondent to the item agreed with item number 33. This conclusion is strengthened by the median value of 3. It thus appears that community college radiologic technology program directors should perform an internal audit yearly of selection policies and procedures to assure consumer and governmental funding agencies that the admission process has been implemented according to stated protocols.

Table XVII addresses item number 34 of the survey, where 92.1 percent (n = 70) of respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that foresight is critical in the student selection process if radiologic technology programs are to survive the challenge of declining numbers of college-age applicants in the 1990's. Seventy-six (95 percent) of the total respondents to the survey addressed this item. With a mean value of 3.05 (s = 0.608) and a median value of 3, the respondents agreed that foresight is critical in the student selection process if radiologic technology programs are to survive the challenge of declining numbers of college-age applicants in the 1990's.

Table XVI addresses item number 36 of the survey, where 97.7 percent (n = 76) of respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that program directors must couple effective recruitment strategies with rational, humane and equitable selection policies. Seventy-seven (96.2 percent) of the total respondents to the survey addressed this item. With a mean value of 3.41 (s = 0.521) and a median value of 3, the respondents agreed that program directors must couple effective recruitment strategies with rational, humane and equitable selection policies.

Descriptive surveys seek to determine the incidence and distribution of the characteristics and opinions of populations of people by obtaining and studying the characteristics and opinions of relatively small and presumably representative samples of such people. For practical purposes, it is highly desirable that samples studied be representative. If the sample is indeed representative, then the results obtained from it can be generalized to the whole population. If 50 percent of a sample responds favorably to a question about use of college grade point average as selection criteria, for instance, one wants to believe that if all the program directors in the United States, were asked the same question, close to 50 percent of them would be favorable.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter contains a summary of procedures used in this study, discussion of the findings and recommendations for further study. The purpose of this study was to assess and analyze perceptions of community college radiologic technology program directors throughout the United States and their usage of selection criteria for prospective students. The <u>Survey of Recruitment</u>, <u>Admission and Selection Criteria for</u> <u>Radiologic Technology Programs</u> was developed and used as a means to identify what selective admission criteria are used to emphasize an applicant's academic performances, to assess cognitive and non-cognitive capabilities and what strategies were used to evaluate the applicants cognitive and non-cognitive traits in predicting student success.

The first line of analysis was to review the literature related to selection criteria in medical education, including nursing and allied health, with special emphasis on the literature relating to community college radiologic technology programs. This review was presented in Chapter 2 of this study. The second line of analysis was the development of the <u>Survey of Recruitment</u>, <u>Admission and Selection</u> <u>Criteria for Radiologic Technology Programs</u> which involved the investigation of an expansive list of items found in the related

118

literature and derived from opinions, attitudes and beliefs regarding community college radiologic technology student selection. The third focus of analysis was to survey program directors of 181 Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation-identified community college radiologic technology programs, with a request for the completed survey to be returned in a self-addressed envelope. If the surveys were not returned, a followup letter (Appendix F) and a copy of the survey was sent with a ten-day deadline in accordance with the methodology of Dillman, who suggested that repeated follow-ups were the single most powerful stimulator of high response: "a successful assessment cannot be done without them" (1978). It was anticipated that with this double request procedure, there would be a 50 percent response rate.

The 52 item survey had the following specific purposes:

- Obtain a profile of the selection criteria that are used to select radiologic technology students.
- Obtain opinions of community college radiologic technology program director's regarding the selection criteria that are being used now.
- Determine what cognitive and non-cognitive selection criteria to use in selecting radiologic technology students.
- 4. Determine the importance of selection criteria used to assure applicant equity.

In large measure, the quality of health care ultimately delivered is dependent upon the competence of those providing care. In turn, the competence of health care personnel is largely determined by the quality of educational preparation for health service roles; study after study dating from the (Study of Accreditation of Selected Health Educational Programs in 1972) has found this. Quality clinical performance requires not only cognition but also proficiency in the non-cognitive domains. It is in these latter domains, especially the affective, for which non-cognitive predictors of success would be beneficial. Coupled with traditional predictors, they would provide a more complete appraisal of the full potential of applicants.

Changes in the types and characteristics of allied health manpower including the field of radiologic technology in the 20th century have been dramatic. Health professions requiring a college education or professional preparation account for approximately 200,000 persons in 1900; 692,00 in 1940; 914,000 in 1960; and 4.9 million in 1990 (Kissick, 1968; U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1970; and Genzberg, 1990).

Employment in the allied health care industry has grown more rapidly than overall employment. In 1900, persons employed in health occupations accounted for 1.2 percent of the labor force. The preparation increased to 2.1 percent in 1940, 3.0 percent in 1960, and 7.6 percent in 1990 (Freudenheim, 1990; U.S. Department of Labor, 1990).

If President Bill Clinton's National Health Care Plan is enacted, most people predict there will be an increase in allied health professionals as the nation shifts from an acute care illness base to one based on health promotion, and preventive medicine. How will students in the allied health professions be selected? Who will make up the future health care worker? Within the rise of open access, open door, higher education; how can allied health programs including the field of radiologic technology, promote access and equity, existing as selective programs in non-selective institutions? This is a problem that has gained the attention of community college radiologic technology program directors, practitioners and other allied health program directors for a number of years.

Cognitive and Non-Cognitive

Research Question One: <u>What selection criteria are currently being</u> <u>used?</u> was addressed in Table X, XI, XII and III and statistical analysis of items 41 and 42 in Part II, the General Information section of the survey, provided the findings used to develop Tables X, XI, XII and XIII. The cognitive selection criteria most used by community college radiologic technology programs to screen prospective applicants were the American College Test (87.4 percent), followed by the ACT Assessment (69.6 percent) and the Scholastic Aptitude Test (60.2 percent). The most common non-cognitive selection criteria used by community college radiologic technology programs were interview(s) (2.8 percent) and evaluation(s) (2.3 percent).

Table XII, "Responding Radiologic Technology Program Directors' Opinions Regarding Cognitive Selection Criteria Used in 1990-1991, By Type of Community College," relates to Research Question One and revealed that in the 1990-91 academic year that of all the cognitive selection criteria employed by community college radiologic technology program directors. The cognitive selection criteria most frequently used were college grade point average (33 percent); interviews (31.5 percent); high school grade point average (31.4 percent); and course grade point average (27.1 percent). Table XIII, "Responding Radiologic Technology Program Directors' Opinions Regarding Non-Cognitive Selection Criteria Used In 1990-1991, By Type of Community College," also relates to Research Question One and revealed that the non-cognitive selection criteria used by responding radiologic technology program directors were interviews (31.5 percent), hospital visitations (12.6 percent) and references (5.0 percent). Thus, a standardized test-most often the ACT-in combination with, cognitive and non-cognitive criteria, were most frequently used to select radiologic technology students at community colleges.

Research Question Two: What are the opinions regarding the selection criteria that are being used now?

Table XIV, "Responding Radiologic Technology Program Directors' Opinions Regarding Cognitive Student Selection Criteria Being Used Now," relates to Research Question Two. Item number 23 of the survey revealed that 92.4 percent (n = 61) of the respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that the goals and objectives of radiologic technology programs and the sponsoring institutions should be related to the cultivation of accepted applicant competencies, so that an effective entry-level radiographer is the product of the two. Therefore, the goals and objectives of community college radiologic technology programs should be related to knowledge, attitudes, skills and habits needed to be an effective entry-level radiologic technology student. This strong agreement (92.6 percent) indicates that community college radiologic technology program directors believe that non-cognitive aptitudes and values are also important to success in the field.

Item 15 revealed that 83.8 percent (n = 62) of the respondents agreed to strongly agreed that high school grade point averages, when combined with aptitude tests, are more effective predictors of radiologic technology students' grades in college than either one alone. This answer is consistent with the research literature: Ferguson (1979) noted that when ACT composite scores were combined with either high school grade point averages or high school ranking, the results were highly predictions of college success. This item would also indicate the need to use broader selection criteria for student entry into radiologic technology programs.

Item number 13 of the survey revealed that 82.7 percent (n = 62) of the respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that using the prediction of grade point average as the only admission criteria excluded students with less academic ability but possibly greater skills in leadership. Grade point average has been shown to be highly predictive of grade point average in academic professional courses but is not highly predictive of grade point average in clinical coursework or subsequent performance in work settings (Murden, et al, 1978).

Item number 12 of the survey revealed that 76 percent (n = 67) of respondents agreed to strongly agreed that the use of grade point average as the only admission criteria limits admissions to only academic achievers. It is clear that radiologic technology program directors believe that non-cognitive selection criteria should be used to select those students who were not academic achievers, but probably would possess better clinical application skills. Consistent with research, according to Gurley, cognitive learning refers to lectures and demonstrations of theories, and to facts necessary to understand a specifics of knowledge. Once this fundamental information has been learned, the student has the opportunity to participate in the clinical setting. It is in the clinical setting that the student has the opportunity to apply knowledge gained from the classroom setting. The clinical environment provides opportunity to develop pride in work, and feelings of self worth, skills in interpersonal relationships, and

123

personal, moral, and ethical beliefs for daily practice (Gurley, 1992, p. 84).

Item number 11 of the survey revealed that 83 percent (n = 53) of the respondents agreed to strongly agreed that the American College Test results were useful in counseling and guiding students. Bello (1977) concluded that valid factors predictive of success or failure were best determined by a comparative placement and guidance program (Bello, 1977).

Item number 17 of the survey revealed that 79.8 percent (n = 63) of the respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that current radiologic technology programs, courses, policies and procedures are appropriate for adult learners. Adult education affects varied miscellaneous opportunities for adults to understand the problems of their world, to try to keep up with the rapid social changes, to prepare for new jobs, to remedy deficiencies in their own background, and to engage in education simply for the love of learning something new (VanTil, 1974).

The correlation between grades in high school science coursework and radiography curriculum counterparts was item 3 of the survey. Of the respondents 73.3 percent (n = 56) agreed to strongly agreed that there was a significant relationship between grades in high school science and radiography curriculum coursework. This conclusion was also reached in Kavanaugh's study of selected high school courses and their relation to grades in selected courses in the radiography curriculum (Kavanaugh, 1981).

Sixty-four point four percent (n = 31) of the respondents to item 1 of the survey agreed to strongly agreed that there was a correlation between a student's pre-admission ACT composite score and the student's

score on the post-graduate Registry Examination. Sixty-three point six percent (n = 28) of respondents to item 2 of the survey agreed to strongly agreed that there was a correlation between a student's pre-admission sub-test scores on the ACT Examination and the Registry. A study by Schimfhauer and Broski (1976) revealed that the math subtest of the ACT outranked preprofessional grade point averages in predicting success (Schimfhauer and Broski, 1976). When all allied health programs were combined, grade point average was again the strongest predictor variable followed by the mathematics subtest of the ACT, and the Allied Health Profession's Admission Test (AHPAT) verbal subtest score. Francis (1990) investigated the relationship between pre-admission ACT composite scores and the Registry Examination for two-year technical college programs. Results showed that only one item appeared to be related, and that was failing students had ACT composite scores of 14 or lower (Francis, 1990). Therefore, there appears to be a correlation between a student's pre-admission ACT composite score, individual section score, and the student's score on the post-graduate Registry Examination.

Sixty-six point one percent (n = 45) of respondents agreed to strongly agreed with item number 10 of the survey where a student's ACT composite score, when combined with either high school grade point average or high school ranking, was highly predictive of radiologic technology program success (Table XIV). Ferguson (1975) noted that when ACT composite scores were combined with either high school grade point averages or high school ranking, the results were highly predictive of college success (Ferguson, 1979).

Item number 20, revealed that 59.2 percent (n = 42) of respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that traditional admissions

criteria, previous academic performance and aptitude tests have excluded large numbers of individuals, many of whom had the motivation and the personality characteristics necessary to succeed. According to VanTil, no matter how we try to group people, we eventually have to acknowledge individuality. "Whatever the measurements we use - whether they be anatomical, biological, physiological, mental, or social - we find that human beings differ, from each other (1974)."

Table XV, "Responding Radiologic Technology Program Directors' Opinions Regarding Non-Cognitive Student Selection Criteria Being Used Now," also relates to Research Question Two, and revealed the non-cognitive selection criteria that are being used now.

Analysis of these findings seems to indicate that while those who select radiography as a career have identifiable personality types, these types are not related to performance in academic courses. Friendliness, impulsiveness, apathy, aggressiveness, shyness are present in different individuals in different degrees and blend into a continuum. Item number 21 revealed that 81 percent (n = 63) of the respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that there was a relationship between age, length of experience in an allied setting prior to entry into a radiology technology program and academic success. Consistent with research, according to Gurley you can evaluate yourself only by understanding, valuing, and helping yourself. Every person has a unique mind, body, and emotions that each must learn to understand, accept, and respect before a person can begin to meet others needs. The learning process can be enhanced by understanding the conflicts that occur as a part of maturing. Making a vocational choice is an explicit statement of the kind of person a student is or hopes to

be. Professional satisfaction will depend on the extent to which the student uses abilities in a productive manner (Gurley, 1992, p. 22).

Research Question Three: <u>What cognitive and non-cognitive criteria</u> <u>should be used</u>, and how should such criteria be used?

Table XVI, "Responding Radiologic Technology Program Directors' Opinions Regarding What Cognitive Criteria Should Be Used and How Should Such Criteria Be Used," relates to Research Question Three. Table XVI revealed the cognitive student selection criteria that should be used and how should such criteria be used.

Community college radiologic technology program directors were asked to provide opinion on issues related to fairness in the application of process including describing the admissions criteria publicly, giving statements of reasons for rejection and a means of appeal if rejected. In item number 27 of the survey 98.7 percent (n = 78) of the respondents agreed to strongly agreed that a radiologic technology program should use the same admissions process for all applicants. The fact that the respondents agreed to strongly agreed to item number 27 supports the respondents' agreements to uniformity and legal review of selection criteria found in item number 26.

White students constituted the majority (79 percent) of 1990-91 enrollments in all accredited allied health programs which included radiologic technology. African-American students made up 11 percent, Hispanic students including Mexican Americans (3 percent), Puerto Ricans (1 percent) and other Hispanics (2 percent), Asians or Pacific Islanders (4 percent), and American Indians or Alaska Natives, less than one percent. Between 1989-90 and 1990-91 there was a one percent enrollment decrease for Africian-Americans in all accredited allied health programs. Otherwise, enrollment distributions for whites, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, other Hispanics, Asians or Pacific Islander, and American Indians or Alaskan Natives were consistent between the academic years (Allied Health Education Fact Sheet, 1992). The number of women in the labor force is projected to increase more than twice as fast as the number of men, and in the year 2000 women will constitute nearly half the labor force. The number of African-American workers is projected to increase twice as fast, Asian workers to increase five times as fast, and Hispanic workers more than five times as fast as the number of white workers. Thus, by the year 2000, the economy will be more dependent on women workers (who have always been prominent in the allied health profession) and on minority workers (Institute of Medicine, 1989). Allied health programs at community colleges, including radiologic technology, ignore these demographic realities at their peril.

Item number 30 of the survey revealed that 96.2 percent (n = 77) of respondents agreed to strongly agreed that a program should describe its admissions criteria publicly so that potential applicants can obtain a reasonable estimate of their likelihood of meeting such standards. Taken together, items 2, 27, 30, and 31 of the survey indicate that community college radiologic technology program directors are concerned with equity in the application and selection process of prospective students.

Community college radiologic technology program directors were also asked to respond to a number of issues related to the selection process, including the understanding of the behavioral domains and the importance of research and information networks. Item number 37 of the survey, revealed that 93.3 percent (n = 66) of the respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that information networks should be

established to permit change of recruitment and selection policies in radiologic technology education. Information networks are becoming more and more important in the area of technical education, especially in the fields related to allied health. Of the respondents to item number 35, 92.3 percent (n = 69) of respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that research is essential to determine the relative importance of inappropriate selection processes. If community college radiologic technology programs are to maintain integrity, research is essential to determine the relative importance of inappropriate selection processes. Item number 32 of the survey, revealed that 90.1 percent (n = 64) of respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that all those who participate in student selection should be instructed and competent in the process of multiple domain evaluation of radiologic technology student applicants. Multiple domain evaluation is defined here to mean incorporating the understanding of the cognitive and non-cognitive behavioral domains.

Item 26 of the survey, revealed that 84.7 percent (n = 61) of respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that there should be a legal review of selection policies dealing with uniformity while exceptions to such uniformity should be reviewed every three years. In item number 27 of the survey, 98.7 percent (n = 78) of the respondents agreed to strongly agreed that a radiologic technology program should use the same admissions process for all applicants. To assure that all applicants are evaluated equitably in the selection process, a legal review of selection criteria and policies should be performed every three years with uniformity.

Item number 5 of the survey disclosed that 83 percent (n = 62) of the respondents agreed to strongly agreed that high school grade point averages or grades in algebra or biology can be used to predict passing of the Registry Examination. It is clear that radiologic technology program directors at community colleges believe that cognitive measurements should be used in student selection to assess overall results.

Item number 24 of the survey, disclosed that 80 percent (n = 56) of respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that valid and reliable behavior measurements should be used in the admissions process to radiologic technology programs. Measurement is only part of the total process of evaluation and tests are one way of measuring. Evaluation is a process of determining the value or worth of something through examining, judging, appraising, estimating, and measuring (VanTil, 1974).

Item number 39 of the survey, disclosed that 79.3 percent (n = 61) of the respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that radiologic technology programs should give more emphasis on training in scholastic skills such as writing and critical thinking as well as afford opportunities for the development of suitable values. In this era, we must deal with real and urgent problems of our times. The challenge is to help the student develop skills so that the student can cope with the social realities of our time, to develop commitment to humane values based on mankind's reconstructed experiences.

Item number 40 of the survey, revealed that 76.4 percent (n = 55) of respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that the current focus on scientific knowledge in radiologic technology admission decisions should be modified to allow for more emphasis in student's abilities to learn independently (self-actualization) and acquire analytic skills and values appropriate to the field of radiologic technology. The respondents agreed that current focus on scientific knowledge in radiologic technology admission decisions should be modified to allow for more emphasis in student's abilities to learn independently and acquire analytic skills and values appropriate to radiologic technology. This means greater emphasis on non-cognitive student selection criteria.

Item number 31 of the survey, revealed that 76 percent (n = 57) of the respondents agreed to strongly agreed that rejected applicants should be given a statement of reasons for their rejection and a means of appeal if they wish to challenge the explanation. Therefore, the majority of community college program directors believed that if applicants are not selected, a statement of reasons for their rejection should be given along with a means of appeal if they want to challenge the rejection.

Item number 22 of the survey, revealed that 74.0 percent (n = 57) of respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains of students should be evaluated, weighted and used in selecting radiologic technology students. The cognitive domain includes all objectives which deal with the intellectual behaviors of the learner. The psychomotor domain covers all those objectives in which the learner is engaged in some physical, kinesthetic behavior. The affective domain is concerned with attitudes, feelings, interests, and values of the learner. Therefore, it is important that reliable predictors, both cognitive and non-cognitive, are developed to assess the full potential for success of all individuals in the radiologic technology applicant pool (Blagg, 1975). Item number 18 of the survey, revealed that 66.6 percent (n = 46) of the respondents to the item agreed to strongly agreed that students, facts

131

and impressions obtained by the interviewer should be correlated to the academic/clinical situations to predict a student's success in radiologic technology. The cognitive and psychomotor domains are concerned with the question: What <u>can</u> the learner do? The affective domain is concerned with the question: What <u>will</u> the learner do?

Item number 16 of the survey, revealed that 71.8 percent (n = 56) of respondents agreed to strongly agreed that standardized test results should be ranked or weighted. In the selection process, objective and/or subjective evaluation of the student is usually performed. In the objective evaluation of a student, references, transcripts and evaluations are normally utilized. According to the respondents objective selection criteria, such standardized tests results should be weighted or ranked. Students with the highest accumulated score can be admitted to community college radiologic technology programs. The profession of radiography demands that entering students become highly skilled technically, qualified by education to perform imaging procedures as well as to be compassionate health care providers (Essentials, 1990). The maintenance of standards of excellence in radiologic technology admissions is therefore necessary to assure accountability and quality care by program graduates. The respondents were asked to check which weighted instruments were used as part of their selection criteria. This general information item was found in question 41. The respondents were not asked which instrument should get the most weight. It is important that reliable predictors-both cognitive and non-cognitive-are developed, and that these predictors be ranked or weighted to assess the full potential for success of all individuals in the radiologic technology applicant pool.

Item 4 of the survey revealed that 65 percent (n = 50) of the

respondents agreed to strongly agreed that high school grade point averages, algebra grades and biology grades should be used in the selection of students for radiologic technology programs. Kavanaugh (1981) made no statistical comparison between high school grade point average or grades in biology or algebra and the Registry examination results, although reference was made to five first-time program failures on the Registry examination and their high school grade point averages, as well as algebra and biology grades. Therefore, it appears that community college radiologic technology program directors believe in weighing the values of high school grade point averages, algebra grades and biology grades when selecting students for radiologic technology programs. Weighing these values can help to predict passing of the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists Examination, as was pointed out in item number 5 of the survey.

Table XVII, "Responding Radiologic Technology Program Directors' Opinions Regarding What Non-Cognitive Criteria Should Be Used and How Should Such Criteria Be Used," also relates to Research Question Three. Table XVII revealed the non-cognitive student selection criteria that should be used and how should such criteria be used.

According to the <u>Essentials</u>, graduates of radiologic technology programs should be both competent and compassionate. Instilled professional values should be evidenced by affective domain objectives and evaluations. The radiologic technology curriculum should purposefully identify professional competencies and include cognitive, affective and psychomotor capabilities (<u>Essentials</u>, 1990). Therefore, facts and impressions obtained during an interview can be correlated to the academic/clinical settings and could assist in predicting a student's success in a radiologic technology program. Item number 14 of the survey, revealed that 98.7 percent (n = 75) of the respondents agreed to strongly agreed that predictors of student success must be chosen which are appropriate to the goals of the radiologic technology program, the high percentage is not surprising, given the competency based nature of radiologic technology programs. According to the <u>Essentials</u>, standards and guidelines of the Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology, the evaluation system should be related to program philosophies, goals, and competencies, provide students with ongoing as well as terminal evaluations and serve as a reliable indicator of the effectiveness of instruction and course design criteria for successful performance (<u>Essentials</u>, 1990).

Item number 36 of the survey revealed that 97.7 percent (n = 76) of respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that program directors must couple effective recruitment strategies with rational, humane and equitable selection policies. Faced with increased competition for students, program directors and educational institutions must become creative in their approaches to recruitment. The Committee to Study the Role of Allied Health Personnel recommended in 1989 that educational institutions, in close collaboration with employers and professional associations, purposefully organize to recruit students from groups traditionally underrepresented in allied health fields, especially minorities, older students, career changers, those already in health care, men for fields in which they were underrepresented, and individuals with handicapping conditions (Institute of Medicine, 1989).

Item number 25 of the survey revealed that 93.5 percent (n = 72) of the respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that an array of relevant criteria should be used to assure overall equity among and between applicant groups. Community college radiologic technology program directors clearly believe that cognitive as well as non-cognitive selection criteria should be used, so that all applicants will be evaluated equally whether the applicant is from a traditional or non-traditional student group.

Item number 34 of the survey revealed that 92.1 percent (n = 70) of respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that foresight is critical in the student selection process if radiologic technology programs are to survive the challenge of declining numbers of traditional college-age applicants in the 1990's. Major economic, demographic, and social forces must be taken into account to assess the directions and magnitude of changes in the U.S. health care system and the implications of these changes for allied health employment (Institute of Medicine, 1989). This finding is consistent with concerns consistently raised at national and state allied health profession meetings, especially with regards to equity and access.

Item number 19 of the survey, revealed that 78 percent (n = 60) of the respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that information obtained in a student's interview enables the interviewer to assess an applicant's vocabulary and ability to be concise and explicit in conveying thoughts. Therefore, information obtained in a student's interview if solicited in a purposeful way will enable the interviewer to assess the affective behavioral domain of the applicant.

Item number 33 of the survey, revealed that 61.5 percent (n = 45) of the respondents to this item agreed to strongly agreed that an internal audit should be performed in the form of selection evaluation as well as external screening of the selection policies and procedures, to assure consumers and governmental funding agencies that the admission process has been actually implemented according to stated protocols. Further, community college program directors believe that this internal audit should be done each year so as to prove that procedures and policies have been implemented according to stated protocols.

Conclusions

On the basis of the previous findings, the following conclusions can be reached:

(1) The perceptions of community college radiologic technology program directors were consistent with prior research of reliable predictors used as selection criteria of prospective radiologic technology students (McCausland, 1974; Ballinger, 1976; Schimfhauer and Broski, 1976; Stankovich, 1977; Chission, 1985). Quantifying the radiologic technology applicants' affective characteristics increases predictive efficiency (Finegan, 1967; Murden, 1978; Keck, 1979; Burgess, 1980; Dietrich, 1981; Blagg, 1985). Aptitude testing should be used to measure aptitude for the educational process structure to produce proficient allied-health practitioners (Merritt, 1972; Reinking, 1983, 1985; Macomber, 1984; Wesolowski, 1988; Francis, 1990). The outcome of aptitude testing scores can be predictive of earned scores on the American Registry of Radiologic Technologist Examination (Lauer, 1981; Miller, 1985; Myers, 1985). Therefore, cognitive selection criteria are used more often than non-cognitive selection criteria to select prospective radiologic technology students.

(2) Responses to the survey reflected actual perceptions of program directors toward the various facets of selection criteria used in community college radiologic technology programs throughout the United
States, because community college radiologic technology program directors are being asked to be accountable or responsible for the educational product, the student. Further, while what constitutes a well educated person is open to subjective interpretation, radiologic technology program directors have a very clear benchmark by which to measure success: passage of their graduates on the Registry Examination. Therefore, community college radiologic technology program directors appear to be concerned with the aptitude, interests, personality, and values all part of the non-cognitive domain, as well as with objective and other evaluations of academic (cognitive) achievement in their application and selection process of prospective radiologic technology students. The problem exists that the Registry does not measure or assess non-cognitive achievements, interests, personality or values.

(3) There are a number of cognitive and non-cognitive selection criteria used by community college radiologic technology programs and program directors. The most common instruments used by community college radiologic technology programs were cognitive in nature and were the American College Test (87.4 percent) followed by the ACT Assessment (69.6 percent) and the Scholastic Aptitude Test (60.2 percent).

(4) According to the descriptive statistical analysis of the responses of program directors usage of student selection criteria and weighted instruments, it was found that rural community college radiologic technology programs relied on ACT results more than metro and large community college radiologic technology programs. It was also found that large community college radiologic technology programs relied on ACT Asset more than rural and metro combined. This standard testing is more prevalent in urban areas. (5) Table XII showed that of all the selection criteria used in the 1990-91 academic year, community college radiologic technology program directors used college grade point average (33 percent), interviews (31.5 percent), high school grade point average (31.4 percent), and grade point average (27.1 percent) the most as cognitive and non-cognitive selection criteria. These conclusions correlate to the literature, which has shown that traditional admissions criteria, including previous academic performance and aptitude tests, have been effective cognitive predictors of academic success, while interview(s) were considered to be effective non-cognitive predictors.

(6) It was found that urban metropolitan community college radiologic technology programs relied more on college grade point, interview, high school grade point and grade point averages, than the other types of community colleges. The medium community college radiologic technology program came within .6 percentage points of metro community college radiologic technology programs in the usage of urban high school grade point average and interview as selection criteria used. Therefore, the findings revealed that high school grade point averages which are recognized as a cognitive selection criteria and interview(s) which are recognized as non-cognitive selection criteria are used, despite the size and location of the community college radiologic technology program and educational backgrounds of community college radiologic technology program directors. The findings of the use of non-cognitive predictors, with the noteable exception of the interview(s) performed in radiologic technology student selection, unfortunately, could not be determined. Non-cognitive predictors when combined with cognitive selection criteria could assess the full potential for success of all individuals in the applicant pool.

138

(7) Community college radiologic technology program directors who responded to the survey did have a significant impact on student selection process, and their believed values and perceptions played a role in producing a radiologic technologist with an appropriate array of cognitive as well as non-cognitive traits. Item number 23, found in Table XIV, revealed that 92.4 percent (n = 61) of the respondents agreed to strongly agreed that the goals and objectives of radiologic technology programs and the sponsoring institutions should be related to the cultivation of accepted applicant competencies, so that an entry-level radiographer is the product of the two. Item number 14 of the survey, found in Table XVII, revealed that 98.7 percent (n = 75) of the respondents agreed to strongly agreed that predictors of student success must be chosen which are appropriate to the goals of the radiologic technology program. Therefore, it appears that community college program directors are satisfied with the view of evaluation identified in the Essentials, that the evaluation system should be related to program philosophies, goals, and competencies, providing students with ongoing as well as terminal evaluations and serve as a reliable indicator of the effectiveness of instruction and course design criteria for successful performance (Essentials, 1990).

(8) Analysis of the items showed no consensus among radiologic technology program directors regarding how to deal with minority students and the use of testing in selecting minority students to community college radiologic technology programs. Item 6 of the survey, the ACT is a valid predictor of college grades for students from low socioeconomic backgrounds; revealed that program directors doubted that ACT is a valid predictor of college grades for students from low socioeconomic backgrounds. Suggesting that program directors have problems and concerns with standardized tests and think other criterion can be used for minority applicant review. According to the Institute of Medicine, linkages among colleges and high schools are playing an increasingly important role in encouraging the training of minority allied health professionals. No strategy for significant increases in minority participation in the allied health professions will be successful unless it directs resources toward the major barriers to minority participation and involves the complete spectrum of interested parties, both in government and in the private sector. To succeed in the long term, efforts that can be assessed must be integrated into the mission of the educational institution (Institute of Medicine, 1989). That minimal prepatory courses or testing exists is a challenge the field of radiologic technology must address if it is to deal with rapidly changing demographics.

(9) The profession of radiologic technology demands that graduating students be highly skilled and technically qualified by education to perform imaging procedures, as well as to be compassionate health care providers. Program directors appeared to adhere to a belief that cognitive as well as non-cognitive traits were necessary to maintain standards of excellence in radiologic technology.

(10) The use of cognitive admission criteria limits admission to only academic achievers and excludes those students with less academic ability. Item 12 of the survey, the use of GPA as the only admission criteria limits admissions to only academice achievers and excludes others with less academic ability revealed that program directors agreed the use of GPA as the only admission criteria limits admission to only academic achievers. Therefore, this reveals, in an implied way, that community college program directors want to give students with less academic ability but professional motivation and personality as much a chance to be selected as academic achievers.

(11) Due to the fact that radiologic technology is a relatively young allied health profession that emerged at community colleges during the 1960s and 1970s, research in the area of community college radiologic technology program entrance assessment and student success was limited, especially in the area of non-cognitive predictors of success. This conclusion is particularly important in light of the high value radiologic technology program directors attached to non-cognitive skills and aptitudes.

(12) Due to the significant differences between rural, suburban, and inner city community college radiologic technology program directors in their degree attainment, it would appear that lesser prepared (AA or BA) community college radiologic technology program directors would not understand how to use multifaceted selection criteria.

(13) Community college radiologic technology program directors have a responsibility to produce graduates with an appropriate mix of cognitive, affective and psychomotor skills (<u>Essentials and Guidelines</u> <u>of an Accredited Educational Program for the Radiographer</u>, hereafter <u>"Essentials"</u>, 1990). Many allied health professional educators freely admit that the written certification test, The American Registry of Radiologic Technologists examination, is primarily slanted toward the academic or cognitive achievement of the student in the curriculum, rather than the clinical performance of the non-cognitive aspects of the profession which do not rely upon many of the academic skills in the daily delivery of health care services (Kavanaugh, 1981). Therefore, to assure quality patient care, reliable selection criteria should be

141

developed not only in the cognitive domain, but also in the non-cognitive domain.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made based on the findings and conclusions of the study.

Recommendation 1: The profession of radiography demands that graduating students be highly skilled and technically qualified by education to perform imaging procedures as well as to be compassionate health care providers. The maintenance of standards of excellence in radiologic technology is necessary to assure accountability and quality care by program graduates. For this reason, it is important that reliable predictors, both cognitive and non-cognitive, are developed to assess the full potential of all individuals in the radiologic technology applicant pool (Blagg, 1985).

No strategy for significant increases in minority participation in the allied health professions will be successful unless it directs resources toward the major barriers to preclude full minority participation. Ethnic minorities are far better represented among adult full-time students than among younger students. Whereas whites constitute 90 percent of the college students of traditional age, they now make up only about 70 percent of those over 21. The growth finding may provide a partial explanation for the alarming figures showing that African-Americans are falling further and further behind whites in their participation in adult education (Boaz, 1978). Such delayed education probably is connected to ppor academic performance in high school and this overreliance upon cognitive criteria, especially dated cognitive criteria more than five years old is inappropriate and will exclude this issue. Community college radiologic technology programs must not shrink, but rather boldly address this diversity challenge and opportunity. What is called for is a national study of cognitive and non-cognitive selection criteria that should be used in selecting prospective students. <u>The selection criteria used should be found to be applicable to all people</u>. This should be done through the collaborations of professional organizations associated with radiologic technology, such as the Association of Educators in Radiological Sciences (AERS), the American Society of Radiologic Technologists (ASRT), and the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists (ARRT).

Recommendation 2: Community college radiologic technology programs, with the advice and counsel of professional associates and practitioners, should evaluate student selection procedures to determine whether more reliable predictors of probable success than those presently in use can be found. Such a study would: (a) refine selection criteria by which prospective applicants are to be evaluated, (b) identify information sources whose data can be quantified, and (c) transform data from information sources into measurable forms. Evaluations of community college radiologic technology student selection criteria should constitute an internal and external quality control mechanism essential to demonstrate accountability in the program. Experts familiar with community colleges and psychometric testing should be consulted to provide advice on admissions evaluation activities. Community college radiologic technology program directors responsible for student admissions should develop a plan to gather selection criteria, perform analyses, and evaluate the outcomes so that reliable cognitive and non-cognitive predictors of success can be used in

community college radiologic technology student selection. Such a group could be organized in cooperation with the Association of Educators in Radiological Science (AERS). Issues that the AERS group should address might include, but are not limited to professional development training in the areas of both cognitive and non-cognitive selection criteria, judicial, ethnicity, minority access and future availability of allied health workers and larger trends in the U.S. labor force. The labor force is growing more slowly than in the past, and the participation rates and roles of various groups within it is changing. The labor force is becoming older; it also includes more women and more racial and ethnic minorities than in the past (Saunders, 1987).

Recommendation 3: Student selection policies should be investigated to see if the policies identify candidates who have actual and latent abilities who could meet community college radiologic technology program goals and objectives. The profession of radiography requires the ability to provide appropriate health care services. Radiographers are highly skilled professionals qualified by education and certifying examinations to perform imaging examinations and accompanying responsibilities at the request of physicians qualified to prescribe and/or perform radiologic procedures. The radiologic technology curriculum should be based on clearly stated objectives that identify professional competencies that include cognitive and non-cognitive capabilities. The objectives should guide the development and use of effective teaching strategies that take into consideration the patterns of radiography health care delivery and make optimum use of clinical education opportunities (Essentials, 1990). Such curricula should take into consideration information on the demographic shifts and changing epidemiological patterns of disease and disabilities, the biological and

144

psychologic aspects of chronic illness and aging, the common medical problems seen in patients, legal and ethical dilemmas, the medical and psychological aspects of death and dying, health promotion and disease and disability prevention, interdisciplinary team participation, the evaluation and assessment of patients' needs, the roles of related health professionals, administrative and management techniques, and communication and supervising skills (Institute of Medicine, 1989).

Although allied health students gain technical expertise in particular areas of concentration during their education, many have only limited exposure to chronically ill and disabled persons. The students may also have only a superficial understanding of the complexity of the physical, mental, emotional, and social problems of patients. Therefore radiologic technology professional organizations should identify non-cognitive selection criteria that can be used to evaluate how students will react to common medical problems seen in patients' legal and ethical dilemmas. These might include the medical and psychological aspects of death and dying, and the evaluation and assessment of other patient needs (Institute of Medicine, 1989). Non-coginitive selection criteria for entry into radiologic technology should then be tied to such dates.

Recommendation 4: Community college radiologic technology programs should evaluate the applicants' existing knowledge base in subject areas such as mathematics and science. Applicants lacking competence in these areas should be counseled to allow for remediation prior to program acceptance to reduce potential attrition and to permit program concentration on the didactic and clinical education required by the curriculum. Objective testing or standardized evaluations should be utilized to provide program officials assurance that applicants can be expected to achieve stated competencies as outlined in the <u>Essentials</u>. These objective tests should be regularly and periodically evaluated by professional testing evaluators to assure validity and reliability.

Recommendation 5: To assure quality patient care, reliable predictors should be developed by educational researchers not only in the cognitive domain but also in the non-cognitive domain. Crucial to the effectiveness of any health care delivery system is the availability of a sufficient quantity of competent health care personnel. In large measure, the quality of health care ultimately delivered is dependent upon the competence of those providing care. In turn, the competence of health care personnel is largely determined by the quality of educational preparation for health service roles; study after study dating from the Study of Accreditation of Selected Health Educational Programs in 1972 has found this. Quality clinical performance requires not only cognition but also proficiency in the affective and psychomotor domains. It is in these latter domains, especially the affective, for which non-cognitive predictors of success would be beneficial. Coupled with traditional predictors, they would provide a more complete appraisal of the full potential of applicants. Given the great need for more radiologic technology students from historically underrepresented student groups, and the documented larger variance in the standardized tests in math, science achievement and delayed educational affects, good assessment of non-cognitive selection criteria would be particularly helpful. If we learned how to test non-cognitively in radiologic technology we could dramatically change the mix of radiologic technology program graduates by "reserving a percentage" of allied health entries after developmental education competencies are achieved.

The Pew Health Professions Commission, a 1991 initiative of the Pew

Charitable Trusts administered through the Duke University Medical Center, was inspired by the belief that education and training of health care professionals is out of step with the evolving health needs of the American people. The Pew Commission suggested that the nation's health professions' schools must play a more active leadership role both in the preparation of practitioners for the twenty-first century and in shaping the values and direction of the entire health care system (1991). In its Agenda for Action, the commission established that the nation must have practitioners with expanded abilities and new attitudes to meet society's evolving health care needs. These competencies included:

- caring for the community's health
- expanding access to effective care
- providing contemporary clinical care
- emphasizing privacy care
- participating in coordinated care
- ensuring cost-effective and appropriate care
- practicing prevention
- involving patients and families in decision-making process
- promoting healthy lifestyles
- assessing and using technology appropriately
- improving the health care system
- managing information
- understanding the role of the physical environment
- providing counseling on ethical issues
- accommodating expanded accountability
- participating in a racially and culturally diverse society
- continuing to learn.

The Pew Commission recognized challenges that health care

professional educators face in their attempts to institute substantive and lasting change in response to the trends shaping health care. The challenges to change come from inside and outside the schools that educate health professionals (Pew Health Professions Commission, 1991). Therefore, the quality of health care delivery will depend upon the competencies of those providing care; the competence of radiologic technology personnel is in turn largely determined by the quality of education preparation for health service roles. Thus, the tie between selection criteria for radiologic education programs at community colleges and the Registry exam to affectiveness as a practitioner in the field needs to be more direct. The time is now ripe for a national effort by radiologic technology programs to develop such assessments. Private foundations in particular should support such efforts.

Recommendation 6: Because the field of radiologic technology is a relatively young profession within the family of allied health professions (only 98 years old), research in the area of entrance assessment and student success should be further explored. The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (1977) outlined a number of admission considerations that should be taken into account as individuals responsible for professional education programs scrutinize their applicants. These criteria included special academic interests and abilities, special interests, prior scholastic grades and rank in class, test scores (aptitude and achievement), special abilities of the non-cognitive type, special demographic personal identification such as county of residence or ethnicity, special personal characteristics, contributions to the profession, contributions to the diversity of the student community and contributions to the identity of the institution and contribution to the political, economic or community needs of the professional program (Carnegie Council, 1977). The Carnegie Council's admission considerations can be said to include cognitive as well as non-cognitive (affective) predictors. How can community college radiologic technology program directors responsible for student selection incorporate these factors into their admissions process? How can program directors design a selection process that is equitable and objective? Research in the area of entrance assessment and student success in radiologic technology should be further explored to answer these questions.

Recommendation 7: Students preparing to begin formal education in the allied health occupation should be administered the Health Occupations Basic Entrance Test (HOBET) which was designed primarily as a diagnostic instrument to assist health occupation educators evaluate the academic and social skills of new applicants to their programs. Based upon the profile generated by this new test, first introduced in 1991, a program can more objectively screen applicants for admission. The HOBET which is produced by Educational Resources of Shawnee Mission, Kansas, provides thirty-two diagnostic scores generated by each examinee; the academic program is provided with a group profile, consisting of computer generated means for seven subtest areas: essential math skills, reading comprehension for science textbooks, read rate placement, testtaking skills, stress level profile, social interaction profile and the learning styles inventory. In the profiles, the radiologic technology program can be provided with valuable information helpful in meeting individual, student needs and providing for an objective screening of applicants for admission to community college radiologic technology programs.

Community college radiologic technology program directors should

look to logical and systematic development, applicant equity and humanistic administration in review of their selection policies. Techniques such as task analysis, critical incidents and/or opinions of professional experts can assist in the identification and rating of prospective students. The statistical tool of discriminant analysis can aid in the choice of desirable applicants. Regression statistics can assist in determining cutoff points on scored applicant data. Upon completion of a stepwise regression analysis of the equations the appropriate criterion value based on the accepted predictors will be produced. Multiple R computations can be used to establish any significant correlation information among the various independent variables and in predicting the criterion at an alpha = 0.05 (Appendix H). This descriptive statistical analysis equation when using the HOBET composite, high school grade point average, college grade point average, the HOBET Index, the radiography program core grade point average and the Terminal Profile Score could establish any significant correlation among the independent variables, and better assess the combining of cognitive and non-cognitive selection criteria for students entering community college radiologic technology programs.

Recommendation 8: Community college radiologic technology programs should make their selection criteria flexible enough to permit counseling, and to place reliance upon professional judgement of radiologic technology educators. A program's selection policies should highlight admission of students with latent or real characteristics of the cognitive and non-cognitive domains (Dietrich, 1982). This can be done through assessment because the key purposes of assessment are to ask important questions about student learning, to get some meaningful information on these questions, and to use the information for academic improvement (Rossman, 1987).

Recommendation 9: The Registry only measures cognitive traits of radiologic technology students and not the non-cognitive domains. Therefore, the criteria of the Registry needs to reflect the <u>Essentials</u> criteria. According to the <u>Essentials and Guidelines</u>, assessment of the graduate outcomes should be of knowledge, skills, values, and beliefs and interactions and relationships.

Recommendation 10: Further analysis of selection criteria used should be done, especially as they relate to community college radiologic technology traditional and non-traditional student selection. In this analysis, a question needs to be addressed: If traditional and non-traditional students meet either cognitive or non-cognitive selection criteria should they be selected to a radiologic technology program?

Recommendation 11: An investigation should be undertaken to assess whether or not a change needs to be made to allied health radiologic technology program classifications, especially in the areas of vocational, technical, and community college radiologic technology programs. Due to classification used by accrediting bodies, professional organizations and professional societies, radiologic technology programs should be classified uniformly, especially in the areas of vocational, technical, and community colleges.

Recommendation 12: Due to the findings of the study, the American College Test (ACT) and high school grade point average (HSGPA) which are regarded as cognitive and interviews which are regarded as non-cognitive should be used as selection criteria, respectively.

Recommendation 13: Community college radiologic technology programs

should provide for an ongoing process and systematic review of program effectiveness. Ongoing, systematic program self-evaluation should consider outcomes related to the radiologic technology students, the institution and society. Program evaluations should focus on behavioral changes in students as a result of their educational experiences and should include assessment of the students outcome. Institutional and program missions should be considered as a radiologic technology program evaluates its goals and objectives, especially as they relate to access, equity and the value-added concept.

Commentary

The results of this study indicate that uniform selection criteria need to be developed to assess the potential for success of prospective radiologic technology students. Community college radiologic technology program directors need to reasonably be certain that their student selection policies identify candidates who will exhibit actual and latent cognitive and non-cognitive traits to provide adequate patient care. Community college radiologic technology program directors should: (a) refine the criteria by which prospective applicants are to be evaluated, (b) identify information sources whose data can be quantified, (c) transform data from information sources into measurable form or forms, and (d) conduct evaluation of community college radiologic technology admissions criteria for validity and reliability.

Accountability in health care extends to the education of the professionals who deliver and community college radiologic technology programs. Directors should assure themselves that the best applicants are being chosen to enter radiologic technology as a profession.

Therefore, community college radiologic technology program directors should initiate an internal review of their prospective student selection processes to ready themselves for an external review, as suggested by Dietrich (1981). When community college radiologic technology program directors meet at local, state, national and international meetings, a plan to gather selection criteria should be initiated so that analyses and evaluation can be effectuated to obtain reliable predictors of success in order to promote uniformity in community college radiologic technology student selection. Despite the withdrawal of most direct federal support for allied health education in the 1980's, allied health leaders have convinced Congress that the health care work force should not continue to go unmonitored and unstudied, especially when so much about the health care system is undergoing change. To maintain standards, it is imperative that reliable non-cognitive predictors are developed to assess the full potential for success of community college radiologic technology students. Traditional admission criteria such as high school academic performance and the result of scores on aptitude tests, which are cognitive in nature, have been used as reliable predictors of academic success. While use of these admission criteria are appropriate, over-reliance upon them has excluded large numbers of students who have had the motivation and personality characteristics necessary to succeed (Morgan, 1974). These cognitive community college radiologic technology admissions predictors are particularly weak in effectively measuring clinical performance (Kegel-Flomm, 1975).

Quality clinical performance requires not only cognition but also proficiency in the affective and psychomotor domains (Blagg, 1985). It is in these latter domains that assessment of non-cognitive predictors would be beneficial. Cognitive predictors coupled with non-cognitive predictors would provide a more complete evaluation of the potential of community college radiologic technology applicants (Appendix I -Weighting Mechanism for Radiologic Technology Applicant Data).

Higher education attempts to give a student more than just an education. It develops talents and "adds value" to the student. In higher education circles, this concept is referred to as "value added." In his book <u>Four Critical Years</u>, Alexander W. Astin (1977) discussed the "value added" effects of going to college. Later, in <u>Minorities in</u> <u>American Higher Education</u> (1982), Astin wrote:

If an institution exists to educate students, its mission is to produce certain desirable changes in students or, more simply, to make a difference in the student's life (Astin, 1982).

The "value-added" approach to the goals of higher education suggests that admissions procedures should be designed to select students who are likely to be influenced by the educational process (Astin, 1982). In the simplest of terms, the measure of an institution's success in educating its students is the difference between the students' performance or abilities upon leaving the institution and that upon entry (Astin, 1982). Therefore, the value-added concept should be accepted by allied health educators, including those responsible for admissions to radiologic technology programs, as perhaps the most important indication of educational quality and institutional effectiveness. Astin (1983) noted that:

"in value-added terms, the quality of an institution is based not on the performance level of the students it admits, but on the changes or improvements in performance that the institution is able to effect in its students" (Astin, 1983).

Radiologic technology students--the personnel of tomorrow--will need

to begin to develop special skills in order to deal with future changes. Because of the dynamic nature of health service delivery, flexibility in the education processes for preparing students to meet future allied health care demands will become more important in promoting growth, motivation and progress. To meet these new service demands, community college radiologic technology programs will have to be aware that the future availability of allied workers cannot be separated from larger trends in the U.S. labor force. The participation rates of various groups such as women and racial ethnic minorities will have to be more prevalent than in the past, and community college radiologic technology programs will have to include the study of human values, illness prevention and health promotion methods, as well as the study of delivery systems, including roles and functions of allied health personnel, patient's rights, legal risks, cost-effectiveness and quality control. Clinical and didactic education will have to be integrated with the range and types of clinical education centers used and modality training expanded to meet increased health service demands. Health care professionals and educators should consider programming activities for all students to promote a positive academic climate. The opportunity to increase minority enrollment in radiologic technology distinguishes mentoring as a strategy to accomplish this goal. Second to recruitment is the retention of minority students in radiologic technology programs. The perceptions and issues raised throughout this survey take on a special significance in the nations's struggle to provide optimal patient care.

Employment in the field of radiologic technology is expected to grow much faster than the average for all allied health occupations through the year 2000, reflecting the importance of radiologic technology in the

155

diagnosis and treatment of disease. The prevention diagnosis and treatment of disease will rely on sound clinical skills, effective communication skills, accurate information, and effective intervention. Each area can be enhanced by appropriate medical technological support. This support can include a broad spectrum of devices, techniques, agents and information systems that can be brought to be in the health care setting (Pew Health Professions Commission, 1991). Long-term prospects for radiologic technologists will continue to be influenced by future trends in enrollments in formal training programs.

This "value-added" approach to the goals of higher education suggests that admissions procedures should be designed to select students who are likely to be influenced by the educational process (Astin, 1982). The increase in medical imaging technology has affected the delivery of health care in the United States and has created an environment that demands a competent as well as a multiskilled radiologic technologist. Machiavelli said, "there is nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct, or more uncertain in its success than to take the lead of thinking." Multiskilling is a new order of thinking about how to change the way we educate and employ our health care workforce. It is this challenge that community college radiologic technology program directors will need to address as they re-evaluate recruitment, admission and selection criteria for community college radiologic technology programs. The objective will be to tie selection criteria to program curricula to the Registry to success in the field and a means to accomplish this will be to examine community college radiologic technology cognitive and non-cognitive selection criteria.

156

LITERATURE CITED

- Abramowitz, Susan and Rosenfeld, Stuart, eds. (March 1978). <u>Declining</u> <u>Enrollment: The Challenge of the Coming Decade</u>. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- Akroyd, D., Lavin, N. "Factors Affecting Student Program and Career Selection. <u>Radiologic Technology</u>, 1992; 63:394-401.
- Alfred, R.L. (1984). "Paradox for Community College: Education in the 80's". <u>Community College Review</u>, Vol. 12, No. 1.
- <u>Allied Health Education Directory</u>, 10th Ed. (1981), 18th Ed. (1990), 19th Ed. (1991). The American Medical Association, Milwaukee, WI.
- Allied Health Education Fact Sheet, American Medical Association, Vol. 23, No. 3, May-June, 1992.
- American Association of Junior Colleges. (1964). <u>A National Resource</u> <u>for Occupational Educations</u>. Washington, D.C. American Association of Junior Colleges.
- American Association of Junior Colleges (AACJC) Phone Interview, July 20, 1992.
- American College of Testing Program (ACT) Phone Interview, July 20, 1992.
- American Dental Association, Division of Educational Measurements. Dental Program Reports. (1975-1980). <u>Correlation Study: DAT and</u> <u>GPA vs. Grades, 1974-75 to 1979-80</u>. Chicago, American Dental Association.
- American Registry of Radiologic Technologists. (1978, 1990, 1991). Annual Report Examinations, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- American Registry of Radiologic Technologists. (1987). Educators Handbook.
- American Society of Radiologic Technologists. (1992). <u>Marketing</u> <u>Department</u>, Albuquerque, N.M.
- American Society of Radiologic Technologist. (1976, 1990). <u>Curriculum</u> <u>Guide for Programs in Radiologic Technology</u>.

- Anderson, P.W. (1976). "Collegiate Programs in Allied Health Occupations - Entrance Requirements." <u>American Society of Allied</u> <u>Health Professions</u>.
- Anderson, S.B., Ball, S., Murphy, R. T. (1975). <u>Encyclopedia of</u> <u>Educational Evaluation</u>, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A.W. (1964). "Distribution of Students Among Higher Educational Institutions," Journal of Educational Psychology. Vol. 55.
- Astin, A.W. "Four Critical Years: Effects of College on Beliefs, Attitudes, and Knowledge," San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977.
- Astin, A.W. "Minorities in American Higher Education: Recent Trends, Current Prospects, and Recommendations", San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Pubblishers, 1983.
- Bailey, J. P., Jantzen, A.C., and Dunteman, G.H. (1969). "Relative Effectiveness of Personality, Achievement, and Interest Measures in the Prediction of a Performance Criterion." <u>American Journal</u> <u>of Occupational Therapy</u> 23:27-29.
- Ballinger, P.W. (1976). "Predicting Clinial Performance of Radiologic Technology Students." <u>Radiologic Technology</u> 47:364-371.
- Barry, P.O. (1983). "An Analysis of Selected Admission Criteria as Predictors of Success on the Registry," Kansas State University.

Belkin, G. (1979). Foundations of Psychology, Houghton-Mifflin.

- Bello, A. (1977). "Factors Which Predict Success or Failure in an Associate Degree Nursing Program: Final Report." Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education. Washington, D.C.
- Blagg, J.D., Blagg, T.C. (1985). "Maintaining Standards of Excellence in Radiologic Technology Admissions: Directions for Future Research on Selection Predictors." <u>Radiologic Technology</u>. Vol. 57.
- Boaz, R.L., Participation in Adulat Education, Final Report, 1975. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1978.
- Bork, C. E. (1980). "The Influence of Cognitive Style Upon Clinical Evaluation," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation). State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Box, G. E. P. and Jenkins, G. M. (1970). <u>Time Series Analysis:</u> <u>Forecasting and Control</u>. San Francisco: Holden-Day.
- Brick, M. (1963, 1965). Forum and Focus for the Junior College Movement. New York: Teachers College Press.

Brubacher, J. S., Rudy, W. (1968). <u>Higher Education in Transition</u>, New York: Harper & Row.

- Brown, Robert G. (1963). <u>Smoothing, Forecasting and Prediction of</u> <u>Discrete Time Series</u>. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Burgess, G. (1980). "The Self-Concept of Undergraduate Nursing Students in Relation to Clinical Performance and Selected Biographical Variables." Journal of Nursing Education 19:37-44.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (1986). "Employment by Occupation and Industry, and Projected 2000 Alternatives." Washington, D.C., Bureau of Labor Statistics.
- Bushnell, D. S. (1973). <u>Organizing for Change: New Priorities for</u> <u>Community Colleges</u>, New York, McGraw-Hill.
- Carlton, R., Adler, A. <u>Principles of Radiographic Imaging: An Art</u> and A Science, Delmar Publishers, Inc., 1992.
- Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. (1972). <u>Public Policy and Academic Policy</u>, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1910). <u>Medical</u> <u>Education in the United States</u>, No. 4.
- Centra, John A. (1980). "College Enrollments in the 1980's, Projections and Possibilities." <u>Journal of Higher Education</u> 51:18-39.
- Chatfield, Christopher. (1975). <u>The Analysis of Time Series: Theory</u> <u>and Practice</u>. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Chisson, B. S. and Lanier, D. (1985). "Prediction of First Quarter Freshman GPA Using SAT Scores and High School Grades." <u>Educational Psychological Measurement</u>, 35:461-463.

Chronicle of Higher Education. (June 22, 1984).

- Coates, M., Wellborn, E. (1964). <u>History of X-ray Technology in</u> <u>Kansas -- 1896-1963</u>. Kansas Society of Radiologic Technologists, Lawrence, Kansas.
- Cohen, A., Brower, F. (1982, 1987). <u>The American Community College</u>. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Coleman, James S., Equality of Educational Opportunity, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1966), pp. 298-300.

- Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation (CAHEA). Allied Health Education Directory. (1987, 1990). Chicago: American Medical Association.
- Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation-Accredited Allied Health Education Program Facts and Figures, 1991. Chicago, IL: American Medical Association, 1991.
- Committee to Study the Role of Allied Health Personnel. (1989). "Summit on Manpower." (1989). American Health Care Radiology Administration.
- Dietrich, M. (1981). "Putting Objectivity in the Allied Health Student Selection Process," <u>Journal of Allied Health</u>, Vol. 10, No. 4.
- Dietrich, M. (1982). "A National Study of Student Selection Predictors in the Allied Health Professions," <u>Journal of Allied</u> <u>Health</u>, Vol. 11, No. 4.
- Dillman, D. A. (1978). "Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method. Wiley Interscience.
- Elberfeld, S., Love, B. (1970). "Identification of Aptitude Criteria for Medical Technology." <u>American Journal of Medical Technology</u>, Vol. 36.
- "Essentials of an Accredited Program for the Radiographer. (June 16, 1978). <u>Radiologic Technology</u>, Vol. 50, No. 3.
- ESSENTIALS of an Accredited Educational Program for the Radiographer. (1969, 1978, 1990). American Medical Association Council on Medical Education.
- Ferguson, R. L. <u>The Use of Assessment in the Selection of College</u> <u>Students in the United States</u>. Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED110497.
- Ferguson, R. L., Brenman, R. L. Some Issues of Predictive Validity Related to College Admission Testing Programs. Eric Document Reproduction Service, No. ED171800.
- Finegan, A. (1967). "The Predictive Value of Measured Motivational Factors in Evaluating Nurse Candidates." <u>Psychiatry Q Supplement</u> 41: 77-85.
- Folger, John K. (June 1974). "On Enrollment Projections, Clearing Up the Crystal Ball." Journal of Higher Education 45: 405-414.
- Francis, C. (1990). "The Relationship of ACT and ARRT Test Results." <u>Radiologic Technology</u>, Vol. 62, No. 2.
- French, R.M. (1974). <u>The Dynamics of Health Care</u>, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co.

- French, R.M., Rezler, A.G. (1976). Student Selection in Four Year Programs, in C.W. Ford, M.K. Morgan (eds.): Teaching in the Health Professions. St. Louis, C. V. Mosby.
- Fullerton, H. N. Jr. "Projections 2000 Labor Force Projections." <u>Monthly Labor Review</u>, Vol. 110, No. 9.
- Geisel, M. et al, Psychological Services Bureau (PSB) Health Occupation's Aptitude Examination: An Entrance Examination for Allied Health Occupations Education Programs, Pennsylvania, 1986-87.
- Glasser, O. (1972). <u>Dr. W. C. Roentgen</u>, Springfield, IL. Thomas Publishers.
- Goldman, R. D. and Slaughter, R. E. (1976). "Why College Grade Point Average is Difficult to Predict." <u>Journal of Educational</u> <u>Psychology</u> 68:9-14.
- Gordon, Margaret S., ed. (1974). <u>Higher Education and the Labor</u> <u>Market</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Granger, C. W. J. and Newbold, Paul. (1977). <u>Forecasting Economic</u> <u>Time Series</u>. New York: Academic Press.
- Grigg, E. R. N. (1965). <u>The Trail of the Invisible Light</u>. Springfield, IL: Charles Thomas Publishers.
- Gunning, C. S. (1981). "Relationships Among Field Independence, Critical Thinking Ability, and Clinical Problem-solving Ability of Baccalaureate Nursing Students," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation) University of Texas.
- Gurley, L. T. and Callaway, W. J. (1992). <u>Introduction to Radiologic</u> <u>Technology</u>, 3rd Ed., St. Louis, MO, Mosby Year Book Company.
- Hansett, E. L. (1992). Radiologic Technology Program Director, Glenn Falls Hospital, Glen Falls, N.Y.
- Harlacher, E. L., Gollattsheck, J. F. (1978). "Editors' Notes", In E. L. Harlacher and J. F. Gollattscheck (Eds.), <u>New Directions for</u> <u>Community Colleges: Implementing Community-Based Education</u>, No. 21, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Higher Education for American Democracy: A Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education. (1947, 1948). New York, Harper & Row.
- Hoenack, Stephen A. and Weiler, William C. (January 1979). "The Demand for Higher Education and Institutional Enrollment Forecasting." <u>Economic Inquiry</u> 17:89-113.
- Honig, B. (June 1985). "The Educational Excellence Movement: Now Comes the Hard Part" <u>Phi Delta Kappan</u>.

Institute of Medicine. (1989). <u>Allied Health Services: Avoiding</u> <u>Crises</u>. Washington, National Academy Press.

- Jackson, Gregory A. and Weathersby, George B. (November/December 1975). "Individual Demand for Higher Education." Journal of <u>Higher Education</u> 46:623-52.
- Jenssen, C. W. (1969). "Influence of Dogmatism and Authoritarianism Upon Nursing Success," (unpublished paper.) Texas Womens University, Denton, Texas. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 028 750).
- Johnson, B. F. "Valid Testing Model for Admissions-Placements." <u>Community College Review</u>, Vol. 12, No. 2.
- Kavanagh, L. (1981). "Admission Criteria for a College-Based Radiologic Technology Program: Relationship of Entry Levels to Subsequent Performance in Selected Program Courses." <u>Radiologic</u> <u>Technology</u>, Vol. 53, No. 2.
- Keck, J. W., Arnold, L., and Willoughby, L, et al. (1979). "Efficiency of Cognitive/Noncognitive Measures in Predicting Resident-Physician Performance". Journal of Medicine Education 54:759-765.
- Kegel-Flomm, P. (1975). "Predicting Supervisor, Peer, and Self Ratings of Intern Performance". Journal of Medicine Education 50:812-815.
- Kiesler, C. A. & Munson, P. A. (1975). "Attitudes and Opinion." In M. R. Rosenweig and L. W. Porter (eds.), <u>Annual Review of</u> <u>Psychology</u>, 26, Palo Alto, California: Annual Review, Inc.
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1986). Foundations of Behavioral Research: <u>Educational and Psychological Inquiry</u>. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Kirby C. C. (1978). "A Look At Radiologic Technology Education." <u>Radiologic Technology</u>, Vol. 47, No. 2.
- Koenig, G. (1971). "Restructuring the Education of Radiologic Technologist." <u>Radiologic Technology</u>, Vol. 43, No. 3.
- Krathwohl, D. R., Bloom, B. S., Masia, B. B. <u>Taxonomy of Educational</u> <u>Objectives Handbook II: Affective Domain</u>. New York, David McKay Co., 1964.
- Lauer, G. (1981). "The Effects of Six Maniputable Factors on Registry Performance in Western College-Based Programs." <u>Radiologic</u> <u>Technology</u>, Vol. 52, No. 6.
- League for Innovation in the Community College. (1988). "Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century." <u>Leadership Abstracts</u>, Vol. 1, No. 12.

Ledbetter, M., McKenna, A., Ramaeber, L. (1989). "Clinical Assessment of Affective Behaviors." <u>Radiologic Technology</u>, Vol. 60, No. 5.

- Light, I. (1969). "Development and Growth in New Allied Health Fields." Journal of American Medical Association, 2:10:114.
- Light, I., Frey, D. C. (1973) "Dual Responsibility for Allied Health Manpower Training." <u>Hospitals</u>, 47:85.
- Lind, I.A. (1970). "An Exploratory Study of Predictive Factors for Success in the Clinical Affiliation Experience." <u>American</u> <u>Journal of Occupation Therapy</u> 24:222-226.
- Lucci, J. A. (1974). "An Approach to the Selection of Students." American Journal of Occupational Therapy, Vol. 28.
- Macomber, J. H., Sanders, M. K. (1984) "Predicting Certification Examination Scores in a College-Based Program." <u>Radiologic</u> <u>Technology</u>, Vol. 56.
- Makridakis, Spyros and Hibron, Michele. (1979). "Accuracy of Forecasting: An Empirical Investigation." <u>Journal of the Royal</u> <u>Statistical Society</u>, 142:97-144.
- Makridakis, Spyros and Wheelwright, Steven C. (1978). <u>Forecasting:</u> <u>Methods and Applications</u>. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Maynard, D., Larimore, D. L., Seaton, J. D. (1974). "A Student Database: An Aid to Student Selection, Program Managment, and Management Decision Making." <u>Journal of Allied Health</u>, No. 3.
- McCausland, D. F. and Steward, N. E. (1974). "Academic Aptitude, Study Skills, and Attitudes and College GPA." <u>Journal of</u> <u>Educational Research</u>, 67:354-357.
- McCune, C. D., Rausch, U. L. (1969). "Vocational Interests of Pre-Medical Technology Students." <u>American Journal of Medical</u> <u>Technology</u>, Vol. 35.
- Melloni, B. J., Dox, I., Eisner, G. M. (1985). <u>Melloni's Illustrated</u> <u>Medical Dictionary</u>, Baltimore, Williams & Wilkins.
- Merritt, R. (1972). "The Predictive Validity of the American College Test for Students from Low Socioeconomic Levels." <u>Educational</u> <u>Psychology Measurement</u>, Vol. 32.
- Miller, A. (1985). "A Study to Determine the Relationship Between Student Scores on the PSB-Health Occupations Aptitude Examination and Subsequent Earned Scores on the Registry Examination." Psychological Services Bureau, <u>Research Bulletin</u> LXIII.
- Miller, Robert B. and Wicherny, Dean W. (1977). <u>Intermediate Business</u> <u>Statistics: Analysis of Variance, Regressions, and Time Series</u>. San Francisco: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

- Mixdorf, M.A., Goldsworthy, R.E. "The Radiography Essentials: An Evolutionary Perspective," <u>Radiologic Technology Journal</u>, Vol. 63, No. 6, 1992.
- Molidor, J. B., Elstein, A. S., and King, L. (1978). "Assessment of Problem-Solving Skills as a Screen for Medical School Admissions," (unpublished paper.) University of Michigan. (ERIC Document Reporduction Serivce No. ED 190 595).
- Monroe, C.R. (1972). <u>Profile of the Community College</u>. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Montgomery, Douglas C. and Johnson, Lynwood A. (1976). <u>Forecasting</u> <u>and Time Series Analysis</u>. San Francisco: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Morgan, M. K. (1974). "Research Needed: To Identify Criteria for Selecting Health Care Leadership Personnel." <u>Adult Education</u>, 24:143-148.
- Murden, R., Galloway, G. M., and Reid, J. C., et al (1978). "Academic and Personal Predictors of Clinical Success in Medical School." Journal of Medical Education, 53:711-719.
- Myers, D. R. (1985). "PSB-Health Occupations Aptitude Examination Cumulative Grade Point Average vs. PSB-Health Occupations Aptitude Examination vs. Final Examination Score - A Correlation Study." Psychological Services Bureau, <u>Research Bulletin LX</u>.
- National Commission on Allied Health Education. (1980). <u>The Future of</u> <u>Allied Health Education</u>. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1979). <u>Projections of</u> <u>Educational Statistics, 1986-1987</u>. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office.
- Nelson, D. E. (1972). "The Prediction of Student Performance in a College of Medicine by Biographical Information, Personality Scores, and Academic Measures," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation.) University of Utah.
- "Occupational Employment Growth through 1990." (August 1981). <u>Monthly</u> <u>Labor Review</u>. Washington, D. C., Bureau of Labor Statistics.
- Palmer, S. (June 22, 1984). "New Test Called Good Predictors of Medical Students Academic Success." <u>The Chronicle of Higher</u> <u>Education</u>.
- PEW Health Professions Commission. (1991). Duke University Medical Center, Durham, N.C.
- Psychological Services Bureau. (1979, 1986, 1987). PSB-Health Occupations Aptitude Examination: An Entrance Examination for Allied Health Occupations Education Programs. St. Thomas, Pennsylvania.

Reinking, C. (1983, 1985). "PSB-Health Occupations Aptitude Examination vs. Cumulative Grade Point Average: A Correlation Study." <u>Psychological Services Bureau Research Bulletin IXI</u>.

- Report of the PEW Health Professions Commission, "Healthy America: Practitioners for 2005." October 1991.
- Report of President Dwight D. Eisenhower's Committee of Education Beyond the High School, 1955-56.
- Report to the President and Congress on the Status of Health <u>Professions Personnel in the United States</u>. (1978). Advance Issue. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Richards, J. M., Taylor, C. M., and Price, P. B. (1962). "The Prediction of Medical Intern Performance." Journal of Applied Psychology, 46:142-146.
- Rifken, S. M, Maturen, A., and Bradno, J. J., et al. (1981). "Uniform Admissions System for a Medical Laboratory Sciences Program." American Journal of Medical Technology, 47:489-495.
- Rogers, J. (1972). "Radiology in Retrospect." <u>Radiologic Technology</u>, Vol. 43, No. 6.
- Rossman & El-Khawas. ACE & AAHE, June 1987. Thinking About Assessment Perspective for Presidents and Chief Academic Officers.
- Rounds, J. (1984-85). "Entrance Assessment and Student Success." <u>Community Colleges Review</u>, Vol. 12, No. 3.
- Ryden, M. B. (1977). "The Predictive Value of a Clinical Examination of Interpersonal Relatioship Skills." <u>Journal of Nursing</u> <u>Education</u>, 16:27-31.
- Schimfhauer, F. T., Broski, D. (1976). "Predicting Academic Success in Allied Health Curricula." <u>Journal of Allied Health</u>, Vol. 5, No. 1.
- Selective Admissions in Higher Education. (1977). Committee and Recommendations and Two Reports. Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (Carnegie Council Series). San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Selman, J. (1985). <u>The Fundamentals of X-ray and Radium Physics</u>, 7th Ed., Thomas Publishers, Springfield, Illinois.
- Sheenan, T. J. (1979). "Moral Judgment as a Predictor of Clinical Performance," (Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.) San Francisco. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 175-368).

Siebert, M. A. (1975). "Trends in Radiologic Technology Education." <u>Radiologic Technology</u>, 46.

- Soule, A. B. (1974). "Radiologic Technology: The Birth, Growing Pains and Naturing of a Profession." <u>Review of Allied Health</u> <u>Education I</u>, ed. Joseph Hamburg. The University Press of Kentucky.
- Soule, A. B. (September 1966). "Trends in Training Programs in Radiologic Technology." <u>Radiologic Technology</u>, 38.
- Stanfield, P. (1990). <u>Introduction to the Health Professions</u>. Boston: Jones and Bartlett Publishers.
- Stankovich, M. J. (1977). "The Statistical Predictability of the Academic Performance of Registered Nursing Students at Macomb." Eric Document Reproduction Services.
- Stewart, C. (1976). "Correlation Study: Selected Entrance Criteria with Academic Performance for IVIC MLT Students," (unpublished).
- Stewart, Charles T., Jr. and Avery, Kate. (Spring 1978). "College Enrollments in Response to Fluctuations in Unemployment and Income." <u>College and University</u>, 301-13.
- Study of Accreditation of Selected Health Educational Programs. (1972). Commission Report. Washington, D. C., National Commission on Accrediting, pg. 31.
- Suddick, R. P., Yancey, J. M., and Wilson, S. (1983). "Mirror-Tracing and Embedded Figures Tests as Predictors of Dental Students' Performance." Journal of Dental Education, 47:149-154.
- Thorpe, R. L. (1983). "The Identification of Entry-Level Competencies for Associate Degree Radiographers." <u>Radiologic Technology</u>, Vol. 55, No. 1.
- Tidd, G. S. and Conine, T. A. (1974). "Do Better Students Perform Better in the Clinic? Relationship of Academic Grades to Clinical Ratings." <u>Physical Therapist</u>, 54:500-505.
- Toffler, A. (1970). Future Shock, New York: Random House.
- United States Department of Health Education and Welfare. (1970). "Allied Health Manpower 1950-80." <u>Health Manpower Source Book</u>, Section 21.
- VanTil, W. Education: A Beginning, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1974.
- Ward, J. A. (1979). "Education in Radiologic Technology: An Analysis." <u>Radiologic Technology</u>, Vol. 5, No. 2.
- Webster, D. (1981). "Advantages and Disadvantages of Methods of Assessing Quality." <u>Change</u>, Vol. 13, No. 7.

Wesolowski, W. (1981). Clinical Evaluations - Who Needs Them?, <u>Radiologic Technology</u>, Vol. 53, No. 3.

- Weil, T. (May 1967). "Developing Programs and Curriculum to Train Chief and Teaching Radiologic Technologists." <u>Radiologic</u> <u>Technology</u>, 38.
- Weiler, William C. (May/June 1980). "A Model for Short-Term Institutional Enrollment Forecasting." <u>Journal of Higher</u> <u>Education</u>, 51:314-27.
- Weinschrott, David J. (December 1977). "Demand for Higher Education in the United States: A Critical Review of the Empirical Literature." Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, Report R-2195-LE.
- Williams, S.J., Torrens, P.R. (1988). Introduction to Health Services, Wiley Medical Publications.
- Wingard, J. R., Williamson, J. W. (1973). "Grades as Predictors of Physicians' Career Performance: An Evaluative Literature Review." Journal of Medical Education, Vol. 48.
- Witkin, H. A., Moore, C. A., and Goodenough, D. R., et al. (1977). "Field-Dependent and Field-Independent Cognitive Styles and Their Educational Implications." <u>Review of Educational Research</u>, 47:1-64.
- Witkin, H. A. (1977). "Field-Dependent and Field-Independent Cognitive Styles and Their Educational Implications." <u>Review of</u> <u>Educational Research</u>, Vol. 47, No. 1.
- W. K. Kellogg Foundation, (1992). Battle Creek, MI: W.K. Kellogg Foundation.
- Worthington, L. H. and Grant, C. W. (1971). "Factors of Academic Success: A Multivariate Analysis." <u>Journal of Educational</u> <u>Research</u>, 65:7-10.
- Zimmer, John F. (1969). "An Evaluation of Four Methods of Enrollment Projection as Applied to a State College System," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation). University of Minnesota.
- Zimmer, John F. (1971). "Projecting Enrollments in a State College System," <u>Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Forum on Institutional</u> <u>Research</u>, Denver, Colorado, Seattle, Washington, 1971.
- Zufall, D. (1974). "Student Selection in Medical Technology." <u>Cadence</u>, Vol. 5, No. 4.

.

APPENDICES

.

APPENDIX A

ESSENTIALS AND GUIDELINES OF AN ACCREDITED EDUCATIONAL

PROGRAM FOR THE RADIOGRAPHER

Essentials and Guidelines

of an Accredited Educational Program for the Radiographer

1969, 1978, 1983, and 1990 by the American College of Radiology

American Medical Association

American Society of Radiologio Technologists

Essentials' initially adopted 1944; revised in 1955, The Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation (CAHEA) accredits programs upon the recommendation of the Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology.

Essentials are the standards for accrediting educational programs that prepare individuals to enter an allied health profession recognized by the American Medical Association. The extent to which a program complies with these standards determines its accreditation status; the Essentials, therefore, include all requirements for which a an accredited program is held accountable. Essentials are printed in regular typeface in outline form Guidelines assist programs in complying with the Essentials by providing examples of how general statements in Essentials may be interpreted. Guidelines are printed in italic typeface in narrative form. و به این است. مراجع می وسیا و میرو روز این است. مراجع می وسیا و میرو روز این این ا ا و هم ما واليه العدم الما الله الما الماني و ال ما تقام هم مسلسانيا كم سيب جو مو والدي الما

Preamble

Objective

The American College of Radiology, the American Medical Association, and the American Society of Radiologic Technologists cooperate to establish, maintain, and promote appropriate standards of quality for educational programs in radiography and to provide recognition for educational programs which meet or exceed the standards outlined in the Essentials

These standards are to be used for the development and self-evaluation of radiography programs. Site visit teams assist in the evaluation of a program's compliance with the Essentials. Lists of accredited programs are published for the information of students, employers, and the public.

Description of the Profession

The profession of radiography requires the ability to provide appropriate healthcare services. Radiographers are highly skilled professionals qualified by education to perform imaging examinations and accompanying responsibilities at the request of physicians qualified to prescribe and/or perform radiologic procedures. The radiographer is able to:

1. Apply knowledge of anatomy, physiology, positioning, and radiographic techniques to

accurately demonstrate anatomical structures on a radiograph or other imaging receptor.

2. Determine exposure factors to achieve optimum radiographic techniques with minimum radiation exposure to the patient.

3. Evaluate radiographic images for appropriate positioning and image quality.

4. Apply the principles of radiation protection to the patient, self, and others.

5. Provide patient care and comfort.

6. Recognize emergency patient conditions and initiate lifesaving first aid and basic life-support procedures.

7. Detect equipment malfunctions, report same to the proper authority and know the safe limits of equipment operation.

8. Exercise independent judgment and discretion in the technical performance of medical imaging procedures.

9. Participate in radiologic quality assurance programs.

10. Provide patient/public education related to radiologic procedures and radiation protection/ safety.

Requirements for Accreditation

1. Sponsorship

A. The sponsoring institution and affiliates, if any, must be accredited by recognized agencies or meet equivalent standards.

Programs in which academic and clinical education are provided by two or more institutions must ensure that responsibilities, including

program administration, instruction, student supervision, evaluation, and other educationally related functions, are clearly described in written documents, such as an affiliation agreement or memorandum of understanding.

Requirements for Accreditation continued Institutional accreditation establishes evidence that the program sponsor meets recognized professional standards for its primary-mission. This same evidence should also be the basis for determining whether or not an institution meets equivalent standards.

Sponsoring institutions utilizing affiliate clinical education centers are expected to ensure that these bealth care facilities are appropriately accredited.

Hospitals involved in an educational program must maintain current accreditation through the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations (JCAHO) or maintain equivalent standards. Equivalent standards include accreditation by the American Osteopathic Association (AOA). Hospitals without JCAHO or AOA accreditation will be considered individually.

The written affiliation agreement, signed by the appropriate officers, should include a clear delineation of responsibilities with regard to program administration, instruction, student supervision, evaluation, liability, and appropriate financial arrangements. This agreement should include a termination clause with sufficient notice to protect enrolled students and ensure an orderly revision of the educational program. Affiliation agreements should be periodically reviewed and revised as necessary. Each institution should maintain a copy of the affiliation agreement.

B. Educational programs may be established in:

- Community and junior colleges, senior colleges, and universities;
- Hospitals;

3. Medical schools;

- Postsecondary vocational/technical schools and institutions;
- 5. Military/governmental facilities;
- 6. Proprietary schools;
- Other institutions or consortia which meet comparable standards for education in radiography.

A consortium is defined as two or more academic or clinical institutions that have formally agreed to sponsor the development and continuation of an educational program. The consortium must be structured to recognize and perform the responsibilities and functions of a sponsoring institution.

C. Accreditation is granted to the institution that assumes primary responsibility for curriculum planning and selection of course content, coordinates classroom teaching and supervised clinical education, appoints faculty to the program, receives and processes applications for admission, and grants the certificate or degree documenting completion of the program. The sponsoring institution shall also be responsible for providing assurance that the activities assigned to students in the clinical setting are educational.

Should program discontinuation become necessary, an orderly plan to protect the rights of enrolled students to complete their education should be provided. Minimally, the sponsor should assist students in placement for completion of education.

II. Resources

A. General Resources

Resources must be adequate to support the number of students admitted to the program. The instructor/student ratio shall be adequate to achieve the stated objectives of the curriculum.

An appropriate variety of modern imaging equipment, to include computed tomography and ultrasound, shall be available.

Clinical facilities shall provide students with an ample variety and volume of radiologic procedures for competency achievement in head/ neck, abdominal/gastrointestinal/genitourinary, musculoskeletal, chest, and breast categories involving children and adults. Trauma, bedside, and surgical procedures shall be provided.

Educational opportunities in neuroradiological, cardiovascular, and interventional procedures shall be provided.

Student awareness and experience in state of the art imaging modalities should be assured.

B. Personnel

1. Program Officials

The program shall have a program director and a medical director/advisor; other program officials may be necessary. In accordance with institutional policies and practices, these officials shall assume the responsibilities and possess the qualifications described below.

a. Program Director

(1) Responsibilities

The director shall be full-time and shall be responsible for the organization, administration, periodic review, continued development, and general effectiveness of the program. The director shall be responsible for evaluating and assuring clinical education effectiveness through a schedule of regular visits to the clinical education center(s). These responsibilities shall not be adversely affected by educationally unrelated functions. The director shall maintain current knowledge of imaging techniques and educational methodology through continuing professional development.

(2) Qualifications

(a) Shall possess proficiency in, but not limited to, the areas of curriculum design, program administration/evaluation, instruction, and counseling.

(b) Shall be credentialed, in good standing, in radiography by the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists or possess suitable equivalent qualifications.

(c) Shall document the equivalent of three years full-time professional experience as a radiographer.

(d) Shall document a baccalaureate degree or suitable educational equivalent.

(c) Shall document a minimum of two years experience as an instructor in an accredited radiography program.

(f) Shall meet the criteria for the position as established by the sponsoring institution.

The instructor experience may have been attained concurrently with the professional experience requirement.

A position description for the director should delineate the specific tasks to fulfill program responsibilities. The program director should assume a leadership role in the continued development of the program, including procedures required by the accreditation review process.

The program director should be knowledgeable of program-related revenue and costs.

Documentation of all visits to clinical education centers should be maintained.

b. Clinical Coordinator

Programs with four or more clinical education centers shall have a full-time faculty member designated as clinical coordinator.

(1) Responsibilities

The clinical coordinator shall be responsible for coordinating clinical education with didactic education as assigned by the program director. Clinical education effectiveness shall be evaluated and assured through a schedule of regular visits to the clinical education centers. The clinical coordinator's responsibilities shall include coordination, instruction, and evaluation. The clinical coordinator shall maintain current knowledge of imaging techniques and educational methodology through continuing professional development.

(2) Qualifications

(a) Shall possess proficiency in curriculum development, supervision, instruction, evaluation, and counseling.

(b) Shall be credentialed, in good standing, in radiography by the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists or possess suitable equivalent qualifications.

(c) Shall document the equivalent of two years full-time professional experience as a radiographer.

(d) Shall document a minimum of one year of experience as an instructor in an accredited radiography program.

(c) Shall meet the criteria for the position as established by the sponsoring institution.

The instructor experience may have been attained concurrently with the professional experience requirement.

A position description for the clinical coordinator should specify the tasks related to these responsibilities. Tasks may include didactic instruction.

c. Clinical Instructor

A clinical instructor shall be designated at each clinical education center.

The number of clinical instructors at any clinical facility is determined by designation of one full-time equivalent clinical instructor for every ten students on-site involved in the competency-based clinical education process.

(1) Responsibilities

The clinical instructor(s) shall be knowledgeable of the program goals, clinical objectives, and clinical evaluation system. The clinical instructor(s) shall provide students with appropriate and adequate clinical instruction&upervision and shall evaluate student clinical competence. Performance of these responsibilities shall not be adversely affected by educationally unrelated functions. The clinical instructor(s) shall maintain competency in imaging, instructional, and evaluative techniques through continuing professional development.

A position description for the clinical instructor(s) should specify the tasks related to these responsibilities and allocate adequate released time for accomplishment. The clinical instructor(s) should meet regularly with the program director and if appropriate, with the clinical coordinator.

(2) Qualifications

(a) Shall be a radiographer competent in instructional and evaluative techniques.

Requirements for Accreditation continued
Requirements for Accreditation continued

(b) Shall be credentialed, in good standing, in radiography by the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists or possess suitable equivalent qualifications.

(c) Shall document the equivalent of two years full-time professional experience as a radiographer.

(d) Shall meet the criteria for the position as established by the sponsoring institution.

d. Medical Director/Advisor

(1) Responsibilities

The medical director/advisor shall work in consultation with the program director in developing program goals and objectives and in implementing and assuring standards for achievement.

(2) Qualifications

The medical director/advisor shall be a radiologist certified by the American Board of Radiology or possess suitable equivalent certification.

The medical director/advisor should be associated with a recognized clinical education center for the program.

2. Didactic Faculty (Professional/Technical Curriculum Related)

a. Responsibilities

Didactic faculty shall be responsible for submitting outlines for each course assigned by the program director; evaluating students and reporting progress, as required by the sponsoring institution; and cooperating with the program director in periodic review and revision of course materials. Didactic faculty shall maintain appropriate expertise and competencies through continuing professional development.

b. Qualifications

Didactic faculty must be individually qualified, must be effective in teaching the subject(s) assigned, and must meet the standards defined by the sponsoring institution.

c. Didactic Faculty/Student Ratio

The didactic faculty/student ratio shall be adequate to achieve the stated objectives of the curriculum.

3. Clinical Staff

2. Responsibilities

Clinical staff having responsibilities for student education and supervision shall understand the competency-based clinical education plan and shall be supportive of the educational process.

b. Qualifications

Clinical staff shall be credentialed, in good standing, in radiography by the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists or possess suitable equivalent qualifications.

Program sponsors should establish policies governing academic preparation and experiences required to fulfill instructional responsibilities. All faculty should be familiar with the goals of the program and should have the ability to develop an organized plan of instruction and evaluation. Clinical staff should meet regularly with appropriate program officials to maintain current knowledge of program policies/procedures and student progress. All personnel related to the educational program should document their combetence to contribute to the education of the students. Important criteria that should be considered include: knowledge of subject matter, ability to organize and present the subject, a positive attitude toward leaching, and participation in continuing education to improve instructional skills and maintain professional competence. Policies for faculty should be consistent with policies for other comparable program faculty at the institution.

C. Professional Development

Programs shall demonstrate encouragement of continuing professional growth to provide assurance that program faculty and officials can fulfill the responsibilities delineated in the Essentials.

The program should provide for the continued development of instructors and should include requirements for demonstrating and maintaining knowledge of current trends in clinical radiography as well as teaching proficiency.

The program should establish a method for evaluating the means by which instructional expertise is assessed and the means available to the faculty to augment that expertise. Program outcomes, such as meeting institutional and program goals, preparing competent radiographers and maintaining professional and teaching competence, should be utilized for faculty and curriculum evaluation.

In college-sponsored programs, policies relating to faculty teaching loads should be consistent with institutional policy.

In bospital and similarly sponsored programs, faculty should be granted sufficient released time from other responsibilities for preparation of instructional material.

D. Financial Resources

Financial resources shall be ensured to fulfill obligations to enrolled students.

The sponsoring institution should show financial responsibility to the program by developing a program budget or by showing financial commitment to the program within the institutional budget. Budget planning should be the responsibility of the program director, in cooperation with the medical director/advisor, appropriate faculty, and administrative officers.

Adequate identifiable financial resources should be allocated to ensure a sound educational program.

The budget should reflect sound educational priorities. Priority should be given to the improvement of the educational process.

E. Physical Resources

1. General

Adequate classrooms, laboratories, administrative offices, and other facilities shall be provided. All affiliated institutions shall provide adequate and appropriate space to assure achievement of program goals and educational objectives.

Documentation that energized laboratories meet federal and/or local radiation safety regulations shall be posted or otherwise readily available for inspection.

The instructional facilities should be compatible with the instructional strategies employed by the program and aid the achievement of program goals and curricular objectives. The facilities provided for instruction are one measure of institutional commitment to the program and the achievement of its goals.

Laboratory equipment should aid and support development of clinical competencies. The objectives and evaluation methods for the use of this equipment should be made available to the students. Laboratory experiences should be supervised.

Offices for administrative and instructional staff should be reasonably accessible and suitably private to be conducive to planning, research, evaluation, and counseling activities. Security for student records, instructional materials, and other appropriate programrelated materials should be provided.

2. Clinical

Appropriate facilities for supervised clinical education shall be available. The sponsoring institution shall assure that all clinical education centers and minor affiliates conform to the radiation safety standards as defined by federal, state, and local regulations.

Characteristics of clinical education centers shall be reviewed by the JRCERT to ensure that they meet the criteria to provide appropriate clinical education opportunities. Clinical education centers require JRCERT recognition.

The program sponsor shall assure formalization of minor affiliations through documentation.

a. Student capacity is determined for each clinical education center. The maximum number of students admitted per year shall

not exceed the approved total clinical student capacity for the program.

b. Maximum student enrollment shall not exceed the capacity determined according to personnel available for appropriate student clinical supervision. The ratio of staff to students prior to student competency achievement in a given examination or procedure shall not exceed 1:1.

Hospitals, physician offices, and imaging centers may be utilized as clinical education centers or minor affiliates.

A minor affiliale is an institution that enhances the curriculum by providing specialized clinical education opportunities. A minor affiliate should meet the criteria established for a clinical education center, except for the availability of specific varieties of radiologic procedures. The total duration of minor affiliation involvement for any student should comprise no more than eight weeks of the total curriculum. Minor affiliates do not require JRCERT recognition.

A memorandum of understanding between the sponsoring institution and each minor affiliate should exist, signed by appropriate administrative representatives. The memorandum should minimally include the purpose and extent of the affiliation and delineation of responsibilities for instruction, student supervision, evaluation, and liability.

One first-year clinically involved student may be admitted for each qualified staff radiographer, certified by the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists or possessing suitable equivalent qualifications, employed during daytime clinical education bours. Part-time personnel may be considered on the basis of full-time equivalents. Technical personnel with primary responsibilities for management/supervision, radiation oncology, nuclear medicine, medical ultrasound, and magnetic resonance imaging are not considered in determining student capacity.

3. Equipment and Supplies

Appropriate modern equipment and supplies, with adequate storage space, shall be provided in sufficient quantities for both didactic and supervised clinical education facilities. Instructional aids shall be provided as required by the types of learning experiences delineated in the curriculum for didactic and supervised clinical education.

A variety of teaching aids and audiorisual equipment to support and enhance the curriculum should be available.

Requirements for Accreditation continued

Requirements for Accreditation continued

4. Library

Students shall have ready access to an adequate supply of up-to-date books, periodicals, and other reference materials related to the curriculum.

The library owned and maintained by the program sponsor should contain enough printed and other media holdings to accommodate required study, to promote independent study and research, and to aid faculty in delivering and improving the program. Clinical education centers should provide access to reference materials to support the clinical assignments; these and/or supplementary materials may be supplied at the sponsoring institution.

Holdings related to the radiography program should be indexed and available to students and faculty.

The sponsoring institution should provide funds on a continuing basis for purchase of periodicals and publications pertinent to radiography. Faculty should provide guidance and direction in the purchase of such resources.

III. Curriculum

Instruction shall follow a master plan that documents:

A. A structured curriculum with clearly written course syllabi which describes learning objectives and competencies to be achieved for both the didactic and supervised clinical education components. The structure of the professional curriculum shall be based on didactic content of appropriate scope and depth, as well as on integrated, supervised clinical education of sufficient volume and variety to assure adequate opportunity to acquire needed knowledge and skills.

The curriculum should be based on clearly stated objectives that identify professional competencies and include cognitine, affective, and psychomotor capabilities. The objectives should guide the development and use of effective teaching strategies that take into consideration the patterns of radiography bealthcare delivery and make optimum use of clinical education opportunities.

The curriculum shall be based on two years of full-time study. A program shall be recognized through the accreditation/continuing accreditation process as encompassing a specific educational period. Changes in the length of the educational period must be evaluated by the JRCERT. Any program, regardless of duration, shall comply with all Essentials. Curriculum content to produce graduates who are both competent and compassionate shall be provided. Instilled professional values shall be evidenced by affective domain objectives and evaluations.

Each program should establish and maintain a master plan for education, available for student and faculty review, to include:

- Institution and program philosophies and goals
- Curriculum sequence
- Course descriptions, course outlines, and performance (bebavioral) objectives Textbooks assigned by course
- Competency-based clinical education demonstrating integration and correlation
- with the didactic component Performance objectives for clinical
- education

Graduate competencies

Strategies and instruments utilized for evaluation of student bebaviors in the cognitive, psychomotor, and affective domains Grading policy/derivation

Program policies

- Outcomes assessment process, conducted on a regular basis, utilizing internal and external indicators to include:
- Advisory committee or equivalent Student and faculty evaluations Exit interviews with graduating students Postgraduate and employer follow-ups Ongoing program evaluation Graduate credentialing Examination results

B. Appropriate learning experiences and curriculum sequencing to develop the competencies necessary for graduation. Curriculum design shall include appropriate instructional materials, classroom presentations, discussions, demonstrations, and supervised clinical assignments to support the curriculum. Appropriate prerequisite knowledge shall be identified. The maximum hours of clinical and academic involvement required by the program shall not exceed 40 hours per week. The curriculum shall include, but not he limited to, the following content areas:

Introduction to radiography Medical ethics and law Medical terminology Methods of patient care Human structure and function Radiographic procedures Principles of radiographic exposure Imaging equipment Radiographic film processing Evaluation of radiographs Radiation Physics

education

- Principles of radiation protection Principles of radiation biology
- Radiographic pathology Introduction to quality assurance Introduction to computer literacy Structured competency-based clinical

The requirements for degree or certificate of completion should be consistent with the requirements for other degrees or certificates awarded by the institution.

Competencies developed by the program shall be supported by specific behavioral objectives documented throughout the didactic and clinical curriculum and shall include, but not be limited to, the following knowledge areas:

1. Patient Care and Management

Goals:

a. The graduate will provide basic patient care and comfort and anticipate patient needs.b. The graduate will provide appropriate patient education.

2. Radiation Protection

Goal:

The graduate will practice radiation protection.

 Imaging Procedures Goals:

a. The graduate will understand basic x-ray production and interactions.

b. The graduate will operate medical imaging equipment and accessory devices.

c. The graduate will position the patient and medical imaging system to perform examinations and procedures.

d. The graduate will exercise independent judgment and discretion in the technical performance of medical imaging procedures.
e. The graduate will demonstrate knowledge of human structure, function, and pathology.

4. Quality Assurance

Goals:

a. The graduate will demonstrate knowledge and skills relating to quality assurance activities.b. The graduate will evaluate the performance of medical imaging systems.

c. The graduate will evaluate medical images for technical quality.

5. Recording Media Processing

Goal:

The graduate will demonstrate knowledge and skills relating to medical image processing.

6. Equipment Maintenance

Goals:

a. The graduate will understand the safe limits of equipment operation.

b. The graduate will recognize equipment malfunctions and report them to the proper authority.

7. Interpersonal Communication

Goal:

The graduate will demonstrate knowledge and skills relating to verbal, nonverbal, and written medical communication in patient care intervention and professional relationships.

8. Professional Responsibility

Goal:

The graduate will support the profession's code of ethics and comply with the profession's scope of practice.

9. Clinical Education

Goal:

The graduate will competently perform a full range of radiologic procedures on children and adults in the following categories:

Head/neck Abdominal/gastrointestinal/genitourinary Musculoskeletal Chest and breast Trauma

Bedside

Surgical The policies and processes by which students receive clinical education shall be published

and made known to all concerned. Planned and structured clinical education should include the following:

Documented student prerequisite knowledge in:

basic radiation protection basic patient care and clinical skills principles and procedures related to image audity

Competency-based clinical evaluations, based on actual radiographic examination performance. Simulation may be utilized for infrequent or limited volume examinations. Simulation should comprise a minor component of clinical evaluations. Sponsor support for the As Low As Reasonably Achievable Concept (ALARA) Opportunities for elective rotations may be provided in areas such as specialized imaging, radiation oncology, nuclear medicine, and medical ultrasound.

Until a student achieves and documents competency in any given procedure, all clinical assignments shall be carried out under the direct supervision of qualified radiographers. The parameters of direct supervision are:

 A qualified radiographer reviews the request for examination in relation to the student's achievement; Requirements for Accreditation continued

Requirements for Accreditation continued

2. A qualified radiographer evaluates the condition of the patient in relation to the student's knowledge;

3. A qualified radiographer is present during the conduct of the examination; and

4. A qualified radiographer reviews and approves the radiographs.

In support of professional responsibility for provision of quality patient care and radiation protection, unsatisfactory radiographs shall be repeated only in the presence of a qualified radiographer, regardless of the student's level of competency.

After demonstrating competency, students may perform procedures with indirect supervision.

Indirect supervision is defined as that supervision provided by a qualified radiographer immediately available to assist students regardless of the level of student achievement.

"Immediately available" is interpreted as the presence of a qualified radiographer adjacent to the room or location where a radiographic procedure is being performed. This auailability applies to all areas where ionizing radiation equipment is in use.

C. Periodic didactic and clinical evaluation of students to assess cognitive, psychomotor, and affective domains; problem solving skills; and psychomotor, affective, and clinical competencies.

The evaluation system should relate to the program philosophies, goals, and competencies; provide students with ongoing as well as terminal evaluations, and serve as a reliable indicator of the effectiveness of instruction and course design. Periodic evaluation should be conducted at appropriate intervals. Criteria for successful performance should be equitably applied without discrimination. Students who do not make satisfactory progress according to these criteria should be provided with developmental assistance or, following due process, should be dismissed from the program.

Programs should provide reasonable time requirements for completion of the curriculum by all students. Program completion should depend on documented achievement of defined objectives and competencies as required by the curriculum. Transfer and advanced placement students should be defined by policy.

On the basis of student achievement of published program requirements in advance of the established time frame, the program may establish a policy for individual student early release. To assure that this early release is not an arbitrary decision and to establish program accountability, the following documentation should be available: 1. The program master plan of education should include the availability of an early release option for eligible students as well as the possibility of program length extension for students unable to complete program requirements in the established time frame.

2. Individual student records should include evidence of the successful completion of didactic and clinical courses and achievement of all competencies as required by the program.

Students should not be released to meet geographical or institutional manpower needs.

Implementation of an early release option is subject to prevailing local laws and institutional policy. Programs are responsible for maintaining documentation to substantiate early student release actions.

IV. Students Statistics Providence State

A. Program Description

Students shall be provided with a well-defined, accurate and complete published description of the program and its content, including learning goals, course objectives, clinical education requirements, competencies to be achieved, student evaluation processes, and the criteria for successful program completion.

In addition, the following items or information should be available:

- Certification information, state licensure information, if appropriate
- Absences/compensatory time policies and procedures

Policy for student reporting of exposure to or contraction of communicable disease Clinical infection control procedures Standards of conduct and performance Disciplinary policies and procedures

Financial information

Essentials and Guidelines of an Accredited Educational Program for the Radiographer

B. Admission

Admission of students, including advanced placement, shall he made in accordance with generally accepted criteria and procedures of the institution. These criteria and procedures shall be clearly defined and published.

Academic and technical standards required for admission to the program shall be clearly defined and published.

Program officials shall be responsible for establishing a procedure for determining that applicants and students meet the technical standards of the program. As a minimum, sponsors shall insure that:

 Applicants are high school graduates, or equivalent, with an appropriate educational background in mathematics and science.
 For academic program sponsors, students meet the admission criteria of the sponsoring institution.

 For hospital program sponsors, an admission committee is established and standard criteria for student selection are developed and utilized.

Programs should carefully evaluate applicants' existing knowledge base in subject areas such as mathematics and science. Applicants lacking prerequisite competence in these areas should be counseled for appropriate remediation prior to program acceptance, to reduce potential attrition and to permit program concentration on the didactic and clinical education required by the curriculum.

Programs accommodating open admission philosophies should establish clear policies defining the criteria for admission to the program. Objective testing or standardized evaluations should be utilized to provide program officials assurance that applicants can reasonably be expected to achieve graduate competencies. If pre-professional periods of study are involved, the policies should guarantee suitable clinical education opportunities for all students successfully completing the preprofessional period. Programs should evaluate the selection criteria periodically to assess the effect on student performance or attrition.

Reasonable accommodation should be provided to applicants with disabling conditions. Technical standards, based on tasks performed by a graduate radiographer, should provide applicants with a clear understanding of physical demands required by the program.

C. Evaluation

Criteria for successful completion of each segment of the curriculum and for graduation shall be given in advance to each student. Evaluation systems shall include content related to the objectives and competencies described in the curriculum for both didactic and supervised clinical education components. Documented evaluation shall be employed frequently enough to provide both students and program officials with timely indications of academic standing and progress and to serve as a reliable indicator of the effectiveness of instruction and course design.

D. Health Services

Students shall be informed of, and have access to, student healthcare services if provided by the institution. Fees associated with healthcare services shall be published. The health and safety of students, faculty, and patients associated with educational activities must be adequately safeguarded through documented policies and procedures.

E. Guidance

Student guidance shall be available, to include assisting students in understanding and observing program policies and practices, and providing counseling or referral for personal problems that may interfere with progress in the program.

Documentation of regular and timely discussions with qualified faculty of student strengths, weaknesses, and progress shall be maintained.

Students should have access to faculty and professional counseling.

V. Operational Policies

A. Fair Practices

1. Radiation protection monitoring practices for students shall conform to appropriate state and federal regulations.

2. A policy related to the provisions made for student pregnancy shall be published and made known to female applicants.

Program officials should consult with institutional radiation safety officers to assure that the policy reflects current radiation protection philosophy. Considerations related to sound educational principles regarding appropriate leave and student reinstatement should be included in the policy. Student counseling should be available.

3. Announcements and advertising must accurately reflect the program offered.

Information should be available to all persons involved with the program and to all who demonstrate intent to apply for program admission. Information for applicants should include program length and describe required travel to clinical education centers, if appropriate.

4. Student recruitment and admission practices and faculty recruitment and employment practices shall be non-discriminatory with respect to race, color, creed, sex, age, handicap(s), or national origin.

5. Academic credit and costs to the student shall be accurately stated, published, and made known to all applicants.

6. Policies and processes for student withdrawal, and refunds of tuition and fees, shall be published and made known to all applicants.

7. Appropriate due process and appeal mechanisms shall be available and made known to all students."

Requirements for Accreditation continued

i

Requirements for Accreditation continued

Evidence should be available that students are informed of due process and appeal mechanisms with regard to unfavorable evaluations, disciplinary actions, suspensions, and dismissals.

8. Policies and processes by which students may perform related work while enrolled in the program must be published and made known to all concerned in order to avoid practices in which students are substituted for regular staff. Students shall not take the responsibility or the place of qualified staff. However, after demonstrating competency, students may be permitted to perform procedures with appropriate supervision.

Programs in states requiring licensure of radiographers must comply with appropriate regulations applicable to students.

B. Student Records

Satisfactory records shall be maintained for student admission, attendance, and evaluation. Grades and credits for courses shall be recorded on the student transcript and permanently maintained by the sponsoring institution.

Students shall have access to personal radiation monitoring records. Radiation monitoring records shall be maintained, as required by state or federal regulations.

Records should be maintained for all courses attempted and/or completed by all students.

The master plan for education should include a system for maintaining records in order to document achievement of program goals and objectives; to indicate compliance with accrediting and program policies; and to provide a database for program self-evaluation. Provisions for availability and security of records should comply with the "Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974" (Buckley Amendment). The system should be sufficiently detailed to provide for the continuity, delivery, and evaluation of the program in the event of staff changes.

VI. Continuing Program Evaluation

A. The program shall have an ongoing process for periodic and systematic review of program effectiveness. The self-study report required by the accreditation review is one element of this process.

B. The results of program evaluation must be appropriately reflected in review and revision of the curriculum and other program elements.

Ongoing, systematic program self-evaluation should consider outcomes related to the student, the institution, and society. Selfevaluation should assist the program in decision making, enhancing input, and improving processes. All staff and faculty should be involved in program self-evaluation efforts.

Institutional and program missions should be considered as a program evaluates its goals and considers revisions based on curriculum review and other elements of the evaluation process.

Program evaluation should focus on behavioral changes in students as a result of the educational experience and should include assessment of the following graduate outcomes:

I. Knowledge—Understanding of general and specific facts, processes, theories, and methodologies.

2. Skills—Attainment of competencies to include academic, clinical, communicative, interpersonal, and leadership.

3. Values and Beliefs-Development of appropriate professional attributes.

4. Interactions and Relationships—Acceptance by the institution, community, and profession as a practitioner.

Ongoing program evaluation should include, but is not limited to, assessment of items such as:

1. Attrition/retention/academic delinquency rates and reasons.

2. Average length of time to program completion.

3. Student characteristics in comparison with other students enrolled in the institution in areas such as grade distribution, membership in professional societies, honors, and awards.

4. Number of graduates in specified employment settings or in other types of education.

5. Relevance of employment setting to the educational program.

6. Percent of graduates passing credentialing exams (with number of attempts) and mean exam scores.

7. Follow-up studies of alumni and employer satisfaction.

C. Input from various groups, such as admission, curriculum, and advisory committees, and from other channels of communication shall be documented.

A. Program/Sponsoring Institution Responsibilities

1. Applying for Accreditation

The accreditation review process conducted by the Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation (CAHEA) can be initiated only at ' the written request of the chief executive officer or an officially designated representative of the sponsoring institution.

This process is initiated by requesting an application form from and returning it to:

Division of Allied Health Education and Accreditation American Medical Association 515 North State Street Chicago, IL 60610

The Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Suite 900, Chicago. IL 60606, requests additional application materials prior to guiding the program through completion of a self-study and preparation of the Self-Study Report.

A program or sponsoring institution may at any time prior to the final accreditation action withdraw its request for initial or continuing accreditation.

2. Administrative Requirements for Maintaining Accreditation

Programs are required to comply with administrative requirements for maintaining accreditation, which include:

a. Submitting the Self-Study Report or a required progress report within a reasonable period of time, as determined by the JRCERT.

b. Agreeing to a reasonable site visit date before the end of the period for which accreditation was awarded.

c. Informing the JRCERT within a reasonable period of time of changes in the positions of program director, medical director/advisor, clinical coordinator, and clinical instructor(s). If any position remains vacant for 30 days, the program shall send the JRCERT a description of the actions taken to maintain the continuity and effectiveness of the program.

d. Submitting requests for recognition of new clinical education centers and increases in student capacities to the JRCERT prior to utilization or acceptance of students over the capacity authorized.

e. Paying JRCERT accreditation fees within a reasonable period of time.

f. Completing and returning by the established deadline the Annual Report provided by CAHEA. Failure to meet these administrative requirements for maintaining accreditation may lead to being placed on Administrative Probation and ultimately to Withdrawal of Accreditation. Maintaining and Administering Accreditation

B. CAHEA/Review Committee Responsibilities

1. Administering the Accreditation Review Process

At the written request of the chief executive officer or an officially designated representative, CAHEA and the JRCERT review educational programs to assess compliance with the Essentials.

The accreditation review process includes a site visit. If the performance of a site visit team is unacceptable, the institution may request a second site visit. Responsibility for the cost of a second visit is determined by the JRCERT.

Before the JRCERT formulates its accreditation recommendation to CAHEA, the sponsoring institution is given an opportunity to comment in writing on the report of the site visit team and to correct factual errors.

Before transmitting a recommendation for Probationary Accreditation to CAHEA, the JRCERT provides the sponsoring institution with an opportunity to request reconsideration of the recommendation. Reconsideration is based on conditions existing when the JRCERT arrived at its recommendation to CAHEA and on subsequent documented evidence of corrected deficiencies provided by the applicant.

CAHEA awards of Probationary Accreditation are final and are not subject to further appeal.

2. Withholding or Withdrawing Accreditation

Prior to recommending Accreditation Withheld or Accreditation Withdrawn to CAHEA, the JRCERT provides the sponsoring institution with an opportunity to request reconsideration. CAHEA decisions to withhold or withdraw accreditation are final unless appealed to CAHEA. A copy of the CAHEA Appeals Procedures for Accreditation Withheld or Withdrawn is included in the letter notifying the program of one of these actions.

When accreditation is withdrawn, the appropriate official is provided with a clear statement of each deficiency and is informed that application for accreditation as a new applicant may be made whenever the program is believed to be in substantial compliance with the Essentials.

All students successfully completing a program granted any accreditation category at any point during their tenure as students are regarded as graduates of a CAHEA-accredited program. Maintaining and Administering Accreditation continued

3. inactive Programs

.

The sponsoring institution may request inactive status for a program that does not enroll students for up to two years. Such programs must continue to pay annual fees to the JRCERT. After being inactive for two years, the program will be considered discontinued, and accreditation may be withdrawn.

Appendix

. . .

- The following materials are available to guide educators in program development:
 - The Curriculum Guide for Radiography Programs Clinical Competency Evaluation Guide for
 - Radiography

. .

- For information contact:
- The American Society of Radiologic Technologists 15000 Central Avenue SE Albuquerque, NM 87123 (505) 298-4500

1

. - - - -

· .

APPENDIX B

ACT EXAMINATION SITES

Enter the c Non-Satu are listed	correct codes for your fil urday test centers are a at the end of each state	rst and available. The c	seconi e only late in	d choice of to to students the test date	est center in block T on p whose religious faith pro e column is the date the	age phibi test	4 of ts ta cent	your king er w	registration the test on ill give the	n folde Satur	er and blacken the orday. Non-Saturday	corre y tes	ect o	ival nte
X = Test	Center is open for that	test da [661 11	te. 7661 5	See your	counselor for the test da	ate.	5, 1994	9. 1994			: :	23, 1993	11, 1993	9.1994
City AL ARAM	Code Test Center	Dec Oct	Apr.	City	Code Test Center	18	X X	X XDI	City	Code 7101	Test Center Thunderbird Advent Acad	124	12	110
Alexander City	9725 Benjamin Russell H S D001 Central Alabama G C 0081 Lbw Coll	x x		Tuscakosa Tuscumbia	0014 Stillman Coll 0052 Univ of Alabama 4708 Shoals C C South Cam	XXX	XXX	XXX	ARKANS	6660 AS	Yuns District Admin Office	1.	6	1
Athens Atmore Auburn	9538 Athens H S 6659 Escaambia County H S 0011 Auburt Univ	XXX	XXXX	Union Springs Uniontown	6753 Booker T Washington H S 7013 Bullock County H S 9008 Robert C Hatch H S	x	XXXX	xx	Alma Arkadelphia	6470 0125 0134	Alma H S Henderson St Univ Ouachte Baptist Univ	X	XXX	X
Bay Ministe Berningham	0035 James H Faukner St Comm 0 0012 Birmingham Southern Coll 6283 Huffman H S		XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	ALABAMA Non-	Saturday Test Centers* 7004 Birmingham Jewish Day School	24	12	10	Batesvile	0112 9942	Arxanisas Coll Batesville H S Baurita H S	Ŷ	XXX	ſ
	0047 Jefferson St Comm Coll 7151 John Carroll H S 0078 Lawson St Comm Coll	x x x x	XXX	Huntsville	9037 Dakwood Academy 0030 Dakwood Coll	24	12 6	10 12	Beebe Benton Bentonville	9898 7123 9337	Beebe H S Benton H S Bentonville H S	XXX	XXXX	XXX
	9181 Minor H S 9916 Mountain Brook H S	x	XXXX	Anchorage	9170 Dimond H S 0137 Univ of Alaska Anchorage	XX	x x	XXX	Blytheville Brinkley Bryant	7107 6432 9773	Blythevide H S Brinkley H S Bryant H S	XXX	XXXXX	XXX
	0015 Semiord Univ 0055 U of AL at Birmingham	x x	xxx	Fairbanks Giennalien	7027 Detta Junction H S 0064 Univ of Alaska 6176 Giennalien H S 6555 Home H S	XXX	XXX	XX	Cabot Camden	8577 8914 6031	Cabor H S Farview H S Southern AR U Tech	XXX	XXXX	XXX
Boaz . Brewton Brundicoa	0036 Snead St Comm Coll 0039 Jetterson Davis Comm Coll 5367 Pike County H S	XXX	XXXX	Juneau Ketchkan	7033 Juneau Douglas H S 7035 Ketchikan H S 9195 Kodak H S	x x x	XXX	XXX	Clarksville Clarksville Clanton	6595 0120 7108	Charleston H S Univ of the Ozarks Clinton H S	XXXX	XXX	XXX
Butter Carricen	6573 Choctaw County H S 6819 Patrician Academy 7015 Wilcox Central H S	xx	XXXX	Nenana Palmer Petersburg	6603 Nenana H S 9093 Palmer H S 7142 Petersburg H S	XXX	x	XX	Cove	0118 9716 7111	Univ of Central AR Van Cove H S	X	xx	XXX
Centre Chattom Clanton	9855 Cherokee County H S 8958 Washington Co H S 9847 Chilton County H S	XXX	XXXX	Sitka Soldotna	0074 Sheidon Jackson Coll 0059 Kenai Peninsuta Coll	x	XX	x	Dardanelle De Queen	9862 7112 7113	Dardanelle H S De Queen H S De Witt H S	(XXX	***	XX
lacione lacione	6577 Datewhe H S 9040 Bayside Academy – 6373 Daphne H S	XXX	XXX	ANIZONA Aro Bowie	7068 ANH S 6754 Bowie H S	X	x		Doer Dumas Earle	9605 9816 7118	Deer H S Dumas H S Earle H S	x	xXX	XX
kotnan Kotnan	7002 Decarur H S 7003 Doman H S 6359 Northwew H S	XXX	XXXX	Casa Grande Chandier	7073 Monave H S 7070 Casa Grande Union H S 7071 Chandler H S	XXX	XXX	XXX	El Dorado England Fayetteville	6609 9616 7089	Soumark West Campus / England H S	XXX	XXX	XXX
utauta Utauta	7010 Eulaula H S 7014 Eulaula H S 7014 Busile St C C Businer Campul		x x x	Cookdge Douglas	6443 Cookie HS 0089 Cockise Coll 9406 Value Llovo HS	xx0	xx	î	Fordyce Forrest City	0144 7136 7115	Univ of Arkansas Fordyce H S Forrest City H S	XXX	XXXX	XXX
orance on Payne action	0014 Univ of North Alabama 7005 Fort Payne H S 7006 Gadsden H S	XXX	XXXX	Fiagstaff Fort Defiance	0086 Northern Anzona Univ 7074 Window Rock H S 5389 Ganado H S	×	XXO	XX	Fort Smith Glenwood	7116 7117 6883	Northside H S Southside H S Gienwood Elementary School	XXX	XXXX	XXX
larpendale	0077 Gadsden St Comm Coll 0060 Univ of Alahsma Gadsden 9915 Gardendale H S	xx	XXX	Gilbert Giendaie	8901 Gilbert H S 6600 Deer Valley H S 0091 Glendale Comm Coll	XXX	XXX	XXX	Green Forest Greenbrier Hamburg	6282 9636 6414	Greenbrier H S Greenbrier H S Hamburg H S	XXXX	XXX	XXX
keenvile tancevile	6846 Fort Dale South Butler Acade 7007 Greenville Middle School 6765 Hanceville H.S	my X X X	x x x x x	Globe Holbrook . Kayenta	7076 Gkobe H S 0107 Northland Pioneer Coll 7079 Monument Valley H S	x	XXXX	x	Heber Springs Helena	7172	Heber Springs HS Philips County C C	XXX	xx	ÂXX
tayneville tuevtown	0063 Waltace St College 9245 Central H S 6251 Hueytown H S	X X X X	X X X X X	Keams Canyon Kearny Kingman	8891 Hopi H S 7080 Ray District H S 7081 Kingman H S	0 X X	x o		Hope Hot Springs	7119 6593 7120	Hope H S AR Sch Math Sci Hot Socions Sc H S	x x x	x x	XX
suntsville	0002 Alabama A & M Univ 7009 Huntsville H S 0053 U of AL in Huntsville	XXX	XXXX	Lakeside Lk Havasu Cty Many Farms	9587 Blue Ridge H S 7052 Lake Havasu H S 7075 Many Farms H S	XXO	0 0	x	Jacksonville	9057 7122 9885	Lakeskie H S Jacksonville H S North Pulaski H S	XXX	XXX	X
lackson lacksonville .	9392 Virgi I Grissom H S 9243 Jackson H S 0020 Jacksonville St Univ	XXX	XXXX	Mayer Mesa i Miami	8795 Orme School 8668 Mountain View H S 7064 Miami H S	x	XXX	XXX	Jonesboro Lake Vilace	7121 9896 9671	Jonesboro Sr H S Nettleton H S Lakeside H S	x	XX	XXX
lasoer Janet Jeesourg	20154 Walker Coll 2011 Lanett H S 6686 Sand Rock School	xx	XXX	Nogales Page	6896 River Valley H S 7065 Nogales H S 7067 Page H S	x	ox	0	Lepanto Leshe Little Bock	9456 6665 9806	East Poinsett County H S Leslie School J A Fair H S	x	x x x x	XXX
anoso Noso Noso	7532 Cathoun H S 9825 Linden H S 8978 Lineville H S	x	XXXX	Parker Patagonia Payson	7068 Parker H S 7066 Patagonia Union H S 7127 Payson H S	X O X	0×	XOX.	12	7236 0136 8843	John L McClellan H S Philander Smith Coll Robinson H S	XXX	XX	XX
Dursvile Dursvile	7670 Louisville H S 7684 Luverne H S	x x	XXXX	Phoenex	5154 Cameloack H S 0100 Gateway Comm Coll 0092 Grand Canyon Univ	x	XX	XXX	Magnoka Malvern	0132 0142 7141	U of AR at Little Rock Southern Arkansas Univ Gien Rose H S	XXX	XXX	XX
Aanon Acantosh	0026 Mannon Metary Institute 8445 Michael H S	XXX	XXXX		8786 Moon Valley H S 0177 Paradise Valley C C	x	xxx	XXX	Marianna Marshali Marvel	9100 9864 9794	Lee Sr H S Marshall H S Marvell H S	X	XXX	X
	0009 Bishop St Comm Coll 9474 John Shaw H S 9728 M Montoneev H S (Semines	XXX	XXXX		7703 Shadow Mountain H S 7086 South Mountain H S 6780 Traver G Browne H S	Ŷ	X	, x	Melbourne Mera	\$800 5163 7124	McGenee H S Ozarka Technical Coll Mena H S	x	XXX	X
	0029 Mobile Coli 9637 Murphy H S 0042 Sonino Hill Coli	XXX	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX		4853 Univ of Phoenix 7090 Washington H S 9172 Xaver H S	x	xx	x	Monette Monticalio	6207 6823 7229	Rich Mountain C C Buffaio Island Central School Drew Central H S	XX	XX	×
komoevile komevalo	0059 Univ of South Alabama 0055 Alabama Southern Comm Col 0004 Univ of Montevalio		XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	Prescott	7092 Prescott H S 0098 Yavapai Comm Coll 7052 Sanuanta H S	x	XX	XX	Morriton	9877 5531	Moniton H S Petr Jean Technical Coll 511	x	x x	Î
konsportery	0008 Alabama St Univ 0057 Auburn Univ at Montgomery 0003 Faulkner Univ	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	Saint David Saint Johns San Manuel	6392 Saint David H S 7093 Saint Johns H S 7094 San Manuel H S	XXX	×	×	Mount Ida Mountain Home Muttreeshore	6864 8716 6151	Mount Ida H S Mountain Home H S Murtraesboro H S	XX	XXX	XXXX
loody louiton	6804 Moody H S 6287 Lawrence County H S	x x x x	XXXX	Sanders Scottsdale	8564 Valley H S 7065 Chaperral H S 6448 Coronado H S	0 X X	X	xx	Nashvile Newport North Little Boot	7106 7125 9860	Nashvile H S Newport H S Abundant Life Schools	XXX	XXX	XXX
	9568 Keth H S 7016 Carrol H S	Û.	XXX	Sedona Selis	7185 Verde Valley School 7078 Baboquvan H S	X	XOXX	0		6876 7126 9477	Central Arkensas Christian Sci N Little Rock H S, East Cam Oak Grove H S	XXX	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	XXX
The Carnood	0073 Charanoconee Valey C C 0027 Northwest Automa C C 6745 Dakas County H S 0051 Natas County H S	XX	XXX	Sierra Vista Snowliake	7095 Buena H S 7096 Showlake H S 7096 Showlake H S	XXX	XXX	XXC	Ozark Paragould Pans	9936 7128 7132	Ozark H S Ridgecrest H S Pans H S	XXX	XXX	×
tansele consule	9067 Prativie H S 9276 Platiview School 6709 Rocentrale H S	xx	XXX	Tempe	0068 Anzona St Unev 0178 international Baptist Coll 0090 Eastern Anzona Coll	X	XXXX	XX	Pine Butt	7312 6281 7129	Lake Hamilton H S " Dollarway H S Pine Biuff H S	x	xx	XXX
coersvile Listeivile	6716 Lauderdaie County H S 9992 Russewale H S 7017 Scottsboro H S	XXX	XXXX	Tube City	8529 Greynels H S 9058 Tuba City Public H S 7097 Amphtheater H S	X	XX	XXX	Pocahontas	9197 4810	Watson Chapel H S Black River Technical Coll	XX	XXX	XXX
ierna iervenson	2018 Seima H.S. 0033 Seima Univ 9804 North Jackson H.S.	XX	XXXX		7114 Desert View H S 7707 Sabino H S 7083 Sahuaro H S	XXX	XXX	XX	Rogers Russelville	9623 0114 8064	Anuansas Tech Univ Russeliwie H S	X	XXX	XXXX
Sumiton Sweet Water Swacauga	4709 Bevvie St C C. Walker Cam 9660 Sweet Water H S 7019 Sylacauga H S	XXX	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	Whitenver	0096 Univ of Anzona 7067 Alchesay H S 7104 Winslow H S	0 X	XX	XOX	Searcy Sheridan Siloam Shure	0124	Harong Univ Shendan H S Sepam Springs H S	XXX	XXX	XXX
akassee	9854 Talasset H S 9721 Theorem H S	XXX	XXXX	Tuma	7105 Kola H S	x	xx	xx	Springdaie	6786	Shion Christian School Scroodale H S	XX	XX	X

•

1 -

ACT Test Centers *Non-Saturday test centers are listed at the end of each state. See page 11 for eligibility. X - Test Center is open for that test date. O = See your counselor for the test date.

City	Code	Test Center	1, 23, 199	c. 11, 199	1. 9, 1994	11, 1994	City	Code	Text Center	1. 23, 199	C. 11, 19	r. 9. 1994	A. 11, 195	City Code	Test Center	1. 23. 19	c. 11, 19	0.5.194
			181	812	12	131			11. 11. 11. 11. 11. 11. 11. 11. 11. 11.	18	612	12	3	Data Maria	D. see Van U.C.	181	ð.	1
Arkansas, o	cont	Arkenses Sr H S	ixi	xIx	1 *	1	Novato Dakhursf	7303 7062	Novato H S Yosemite H S	XX		x		Buena Vista 7212 Burkington 7213	Buena Vista H S Burkington H S	x	XX	
rumann	7134	Trumann H S	x	12	X		Dakland	7191 7182	McCtymonds H S Oakland Tech H S	X	x	xx	X	Canon City 7214 Castle Rock 8928	Canon City H S Douglas County H S	XX	x	X
Van Buren	8912	Van Buren H S	X	x x	x	X	Oceanside	0352	Miracosta Coli		X	X		Cedaredge 6842	Cegareoge H S	X		
Valdron	9670	Waldron H S	X	X.	X	1.1	kinda	0210 7183	Chapman Coll Micamonte H.S.	X	x	XX	x	Colorado Sport 7224	Coronado H S	X		
Narren	9894	Warren H S	X	x x	1	11	Rosi	6114	Orosi H S	12	X	1		7189	Doherty H S	X	X	X
West Memphys	6415	West Memphis Christian School	131	XX	X	1.1	Danard Paim Scence	9071	Rio Mesa H S Paim Sonnos H S	X	X	K L	X	6421 9436	Fountain Valley School Harrison H S	x	X	
Whole Hall	9643	West Memoria Sr H S White Hall H S	1XI	λĺ.	Â	1	alos Vos Est	9245	Palos Verdes Intermed Sch	x	x	۱.,	x	7217	Mitchell H S	X	X	X
Wison	7130	Rivercrest H S	X	XX	X		asadena	6495	John Mur H S Patterson H S		x	X	X	7216	Paimer H S Ramoart H S	X		×
Technie	6263	Wynne H S Yellysle Summit H S	X	XX	X		Juncy	7186	Duincy Jr Sr High	^	X	x		7218	Wasson H S	x	x	x
ARKANSAS No	n-Satur	day Test Centers"	11	1	1	1 1	Red Bluff	8515	Red Bluff Union H S	1		X	1.	Contel 7220	Montezuma Cortez H S	X	x	×
Gentry	7110	Ozark Academy	24		10	LI	Rediey	6154	Reedley H S	x	1	X	1	Creede 9523	Creede Consolidated H S	1		x
CALIFOR	NIA			125			Riverside	6469	John North H S	1.	2	× .	X	Delta 7245	Detta H S Abraham Lincoln H S	X	x	x
Agoura	7137	Agoura H S	LI	1	1	1x	Bocklin	0429	Sierra Coll	1 X	x	â â	â	7235	Bear Creek HS	11	Ŷ	ĩ
Lameda -	0238	Coll of Alameda Motor: H S	X		0	X	Iohnert Park	9359	Rancho Cotate H S	X	~	X	~	7228	George Washington H S	1.	ž	ž
knaheim	6259	Anaheim H S	1.1	XX	X	X	acramento	0158	American River Coll		x >	d	x	7225	Manual H S	1x	1	x
Antioch Anoie Valley	8331	Antioch H S	X	X	×	X	and a state of the	6806	Christian Brothers H S	X		X	X	0519	Metropolitan St Coll Monimetic H S	X	X	X
Arcadia	8061	Arcadia H S		x x	1	x		8827	Grant Union H S		Ŷ.	X	^	7227	North H S	Ŷ	x	x
Arcata	9084	Arcata H S	1.1	č.	1×	1X		9120	Luther Burbank Sr H S	X	X	X	X	0525	Regis Coll	X	ž.	X
Avenal	6680	Avenal H S	Ŷ	11	1	11	alnas	0250	Hartnell Coll	X	2h	x	Ŷ	7219	West Denver H S	1	Ŷ	
Baker	6629	Baker H S Cal St How Bakers field	1.1	Š.	10		an Bernardino	0205	Cal St Univ San Bernardino		X	X		Durango 0510	Fort Lawis Col	X	š	×
Barstow	0169	Barstow Col	1X	x x	X	X	an Brunn	7718	San Bernardino Valley Coll Capyching H S	1X	X S	Y	x	Englewater 7239 Englewood 7170	Cherry Creek H S	Â	Ŷ	x
shop	88%	Bishop Union H S	0			1.1	an Clemente	7184	San Clemente HS	1	1	X		6802	Shendan H S	X	X	1
syste	5239	Liberty Union H S	x	^	x	1 1	San Diego	0439	National Univ	1	× .	X	Š	Estes Park 7240	Park HS Everyment HS	X		
anyon Country	8806	Canyon H S	X	X	X	X		6732	Rancho Bernardo H S	Ŷ	x '	X	Ŷ	Fort Collins 0504	Colorado St Univ	Ŷ	x	x
armichael	6800	Jesuit High Coll Prep	1x1	Ϋ́, Υ	Y	Ix.	in Franciste	8999	Southwest H S	X	3 3	X	Š	Fort Morgan 7231	Fort Morgan H S	X		X
1.35	6459	Pleasant Valley Sr H S	X	x r	Îx	X	an Francisco	8660	Galieo H S	^	2 S		1	Glenwood Spas 0501	Colorado Mountain Col	Ŷ	x	x
Two Vers	6756	Don Antonio Lugo H S	X	Š Š	1 ž	1.		0404	San Francisco St Univ				X	Granby 7234	Middle Park H S	X		ŝ
Cous Heights	6317	Mesa Verde H S	Ŷ	° ^	1^	11	an Jose	6404	James Lick H S	x	^	x	*	Graeley 05/18	Univ of Northern CO	Ŷ	â.	â
ions .	9703	Clowis H S		X	X			9607	Oak Grove H S	X	X.	10	X	Gunnison 0536	Western St Coll	X		
Corcoran	6841	Corcoran HS	x	2	1		an Luis Obison	0410	Cuesta Coll	1X	* ,	X	×	Hotchkiss 85/2	Highlandos Hanch Sr H S Hotchkiss H S	x		
osta Mesa	0354	Orange Coast Col	X	XX	X	X	an Marcos	0366	Palomar Coll	X	x	X	X	Ignacio 6412	Ignacio H S	X	1	÷
voress in	98.36	Cypress HS	x	x X	1	1 X	an Pedro	6137	San Pedro H S Mater Dei H S	1.	¥		Ŷ	La Junta 0522	Crero Jr Coll Centaururs H S	X	X	۴
Day Cay	9664	Jetterson H S	X		1		anta Barbara	0418	Santa Barbara City Col	x	â		1	Lakewood 0508	Red Rocks Comm Coll	x	Ŷ	x
Namond Bar	6492 9803	Diamond Bar H S	X	XX	X	X	anta Mana	9127	Righetti H S Santa Borra H S		Ş.	1×	X	Lamar 0514	Lamar Comm Coll	X	X	x
Non	8880	Dixon H S	X		×		outh Lk Tahoe	9038	South Tahoe H S	Â	^ '	1^	X	Lmon 1. 7241	Limon H S	â	1	x
Downey	9048	Warren H S El Calon Valley H S	1XI	XX	1	X	tockton	0240	Univ of the Pacific		S >	X	X	Littleton 0497	Arapahoe Comm Coll	1 X	X	X
n value	0279	Grossmont Coll	11	x	x	11	un Valiev	9930	J H Francis Polytech H S	1X	2 I		x	Lonomont 7243	Lonomont Sr H S	1X	â	x
Escondido .	6789	Orange Gien H S	X	×			usanville	9943	Lassen H S		X	X	1	Meeker 7050	Meeker H S	0	1	Ĵ
arheid	7149	Fartield H S	12	x	Â		utter Creek	8941	Amador County H S	y I	×		y	Northoleon 9104	Northolenn H S	X	X	x
on Bragg	7419	Fort Bragg H S		0	12	1 6	eliachapi	6784	Tehachapi H S	Ŷ		x	1	Nucla 7205	Nucla H S	ô	01	ĩ
resno	7154	American H S Bulard H S	1X	ŶŶ	X	x l	emecula	6794	The Liniteid School	X			X	Ouray 6452 Panois 6997	Duray H S Pagna H S	Y	×	
	C185	California Christian Coll	1X	xx	X	X I	ulare	9499	Tulare Western H S	1	xľ	1	^	Parachute 8399	Grand Valley HS	1		
Sec.	6797	Clovis West H S	X	×	1 č	X	ulelake	6426	Tuielake H S	X	1			Parker 9428	Ponderosa H S		1	÷
	6891	Fullerton Union H S	X	XX	1x	X	uson Ikiah	9247	likan HS	1×	χľ,	Ŷ	×	Pueblo 0492	U of Southern CO	Ŷ	â	X
droy	0390	Gavian Coli	1.1	XI.		1.1	pland	7742	Upland H S	X	X	(])	x	Rangely 7233	Rangery H S	0	0	1
cass Valey	6813	Nevada Union H S	121	άĮΫ.	1X	1 X	aliejo	9055	Valleic Sr H S	1		X	4	Rocky Ford 6862	Rocky Ford H S Saluta H S	X		¥
santord .	9822	Hanford H S		XX	1	L.K	ctorville	0475	Victor Valley Coll	Ŷ	X		Ŷ	San Luis 9514	Centennial H S	11	x	1
tayward .	0154	Cal St Univ Hayward	X	XX	X	X	isaka	6169	Golden West H S	X		X	S	Steamboat Spgs 7248	Steamboat Springs H S	X	X	ų.
ndio .	7160	Indio H S	X	x x		x	Veaverville	9994	Innty H S	1 x	^ ?	1×	*	Strasburg 6308	Strasburg H S	Â	^	5
boowsee	9465	Morningside H S	X	XX	X	X	Veed	0247	Coll of the Siskiyous	11	X	1		Stratton 6860	Stratton H S		X	
lentield	0230	Col of Mann	F F	2L	1	X	Vinters	6805 8841	Winters Joint Union H S Woodtake Union H S	11	X	ir	X	Tronton 6743	Skyview H S Translad H S	X	Ŷ	ĸ
ung City	7161	King City Joint Union H S	X				Voodland	6165	Woodland H S	X	x	X		0528	Trinidad St Jr Coll	X		x
a Habra a Verne	6656	Damen H S	X	<u> </u>	x	x !	Voodland Hills	6344	El Camino Real H S	X	X X	1 X	X	Walsenburg 7252	John Mail H S Watch H S	1	x	
alayete	7163	Acalanes H S	1X	XX	î	X.	AL IEORNIA No.	6/31	Tube City H S	1	^	1×		Westminister 05/07	Front Range Comm Coll	1	x	
axe Arrowhead	6365	Rim of the World H S		1.	X	1,13	ACTIVITY OF THE REAL PROF	0362	Pacific Lincon Col		12	10		7250	Westminister H S	X	X	ŝ
amoore	7056	Lemoore H S	X	^ ^	x	11	snom	7139	Armona Union Academy		12	10		Woodland Park 6753 Wray 7251	Wrav H S	x	^	ň
ompoc	9163	Cabrino H S		X _	10	1.1	akersfield	9020	Bakersheld Academy	24	12	10		Yuma 7253	Yuma H S	11	x	
ong Beach	0302	Long Beach City Coll	11	Ϋ́ι×	X	1 1	scondido	9031	San Pasquel Academy	14	12	10		COLORADO Non-Satur	day Test Corners*			
os Angeles	6816	Bet Air Prep School	X	1.	X		resno	7153	Fresho Adventist Academy	24	12	10		Denver 7226	Mile High Academy	24		
adva.	0320	Cal St Univ Los Angeles	X	X	X		arden Grove	7168	Gendale Academy		12	10		Loweland 7242	Campion Academy	124	12	0
1.1.1	\$720	Jordan H S	Ŷ	xx	Â	x ;	veakdsburg	7159	Rio Lindo Academy		12	10		CONNECTICU	1			
10.12	8904	Locke H S	X	XX	X	X	a Seiva Beach	7202	Monterey Bay Academy	24	12 6	10		Danbury . 9468 East Hartford 7000	East Hartlord H S	X	x	ž
- 14 M	5074 0470	U of Southern Cal	E b	xIx	x	1 kl	oma Linda	7204	Loma Linda Academy	14	12	10		Hamden 7256	Hamdem H S		x	2
	6886	Univ H S	X	XX	X	XI	boowny	7169	Lynwood Advert Academy	11	12			Linchheid 6144	Litchfield H S	X		
11.11.4	5320	Washington Preparatory H S Westmoester H S		÷.	X		Acuntain View	7176	Mountain View Academy		12	10		Millord 7258	Millord Academy	^	x	
	6580	Woodrow Wilson HS		2		x	ational City	7177	San Diego Academy		12	10		Sansbury 6885	Salisbury School		X	
Aammoth Lakes	\$215	Mammoth H S	X	1	X	1.1:	ewbury Park	7203	Newtury Park Academy	24	12			Stamlord 7261	Westwin H S Chosen Rosenson Hall		¥1	
AARDOSA ACA/THAT	8255	Manposa Co H S		x	x	X S	aradise	7147	Paradise Adventist School	24	12 6	10		Waterbury 8952	Crosby H S	X	1	x
Herced .	7150	Merced H S North Campus	X	×	X	X	iverside	8964	La Sierra Academy	1.1	12	10		West Hartford 0606	Unn of Hartford	X	X	_
Invotetown	6871	Modetown HS	X	*		1,1	an Gabrel	9680	ban Gabhel Academy	24	_	110		DELAWARE	a vet sease	100	1972	
Wession View	6719	Capistrano Valley H S	Ŷ	1	Ŷ	1 x I	ULURAD	U		1		1-1		Camden 8927	Caesar Rodney Sr H S		x	
Locasto -	0363	Saddleback Coll	X	S S	X	X	rvada	7208	Adams St Coll Arvada West H S	X	XI	XX	X	Millord 7255	Millord Sr H S	x		x
Acute	6723	Molave H S	x	° *	Ŷ	11	urora	8910	Eagleorest H S	X	x	x	X	Warrington 7266	Brandywine H S	X	X	x
Aomerey	8071	Monterey H S		1	X			9849	Lateway H S Hinkley H S	1X	X R	X	x	DISTRICT OF	COLUMBIA			1
Acuntain View	7175	Mith Verw H S (Old Await HS)	x	x x	X	x		9269	Overland H S	1x	x ľ	Ŷ	x	Washington 0695	Univ of District of Columbia	1	1	_
NCR.	0342	Napa Valley Coli		X	12	1.1		9848	Rangeview H S Smore Hall H S	1,1		Y	X	FLORIDA	DUTIN DELIVERY SEEN			
ational City	9750	Sweetwater Union H S	X	xx	X	1X	non	9026	Batte Mountain H S	1x		11	x	Artamonte Spgs \$216	Lake Brantley HS	X	XI	×
and Dente	7179	Corona Del Mar H S	X	XX	X	X	oulder	7210	Farvew HS	X	X	X	x	Avon Park 0759 Belie Giade 6168	Giades Central Comm H S	Ŷ	Ŷ	ŝ
WILLI'L DOLLET		and a second s	$i \subseteq 1^{\circ}$	12	17	1210	tion milliold	2242	Descent of the P	e 11	- L	1X	1	Deve Glade 6158	Glades Central Comm H S	1.7		2

12 α_{z}

Continued on next page

 $x^{\frac{1}{2}}$

City	Code	Test Center	ct. 23, 15	ab 5 19	pr. 9, 199	City	Cod	Test Center	1.23.1	ab. 5. 19	pr. 9. 19	S . City	Code	Test Center	1 23 1	000 11. I	eb. 5, 19	un. 11, 15
lorida, cont		1997-1997 1998 1997 1997 1998	101	010	131	-	6378	River Ridge H S	X	X	1	X Canton	6375	Sequoyah H S	13	11	XXX	n'
oca Raton	8732 9083	Blountstown H S Boca Ration H S	XX	x	XX	North Mami B	n 9712	North Miami Beach Sr H S Central Florida C C	× ×	XXX	×	X Cartersville	7437 0	Cartersville City H S Dekalo Coll	Ŷ		xx	x
	8756 9662	Olympic Heights Comm Hs Pope John Paul II H S	X	X		X Oreant	7709	Lake Weir H S	x	XX	X	X College Park	8405 8	Seryamin E Banneker H S	l^	X	1	Ŷ
onifay	7286 6370	Spanish River H S Holmes County H S	XX	xx	XX	X Oksechobee Opa Locka	6160	Carol City Sr H S	x	x x	x	X Columbus	4879	Columbus Technical Institute	X	â	xx	x
racienton	8630 9677	Manatee H S Brandon H S	X	XXX	XX	X Orange Park	6174	St Johns Country Day School	x	1	Â	Cumming	6307	South Forsyth H S	ŝ	1.1	1	
ranford -	9553 7169	Branlord H S	X	XX		Ortando	9565 7680	Boone H S Colonial H S	x	XX	x	X Dation Decatur	9097 S 8851 S	Southeast Whitfield Co H S Southwest Dekalo H S	X	X	XX	x
akahan	8815	West Nassau County H S	10	ζľ°		\$	6895 8846	Cypress Creek H S Dr Philips H S	x	XX	XX	X Dukith	0662 5	South Georgia Coll	×	X	xX	
arrabele	6173	Carrabelle H S	121	ÛX	1.1	2	9214	Evens H S Heritage Prenaratory School	X	XX	X	Eastman	6237 C	Dodge County H S avene County H S	X	x		
hipley /	9755	Chipley H S	x	Â	1		6182	Lake Highland Prep Sch	1	<u>^</u>	X	Fort Valley	0814 4	ort Valley St Coll	X	X		
keanwater kewnston	9122 7291	Clearwater H S Clewiston H S	X	XXX	X	× · · ·	7311	University H S	ŝ	XX	Â	Gariosting	7298 6	Inverside Military Academy -	10	X	xx	n.
occe occnut Creek	9123 8705	Cocoa H S Coconut Creek H S	X	xX	XX	x Oviedo	0736	Oviedo H S	X	XX	X	X Jefferson	8784	efferson H S	Ŷ	11		
ooper City oral Gables	9595 6221	Cooper City H S Coroli Gubies Sr H S	X	x	X	x Palatka	6342	Pace H S Palatka H S	X	xX	x	X Jesup La Grange	0834	a Grange Coll	x		^	
oral Springs	9971	Coral Springs H S	X	XX	X	X Pairr Boh Gard	0753 ns 6430	St Johns River C C William T Dwyer Comm Hs		X		X Lawrenceville Lithonia	9817 0 8988 5	Central Gwinnett H S Shikoh H S	XX	X	XXX	x
weitien	8995	Crestvew Sr H S	1 X	XX	x	X Panaina City Pensacola	7283	Bay HS Escamba HS	XX	XXX	XX	X Lovejoy	6295 L 0838 #	ovejoy H S 4 . Aarcar Univ		x	X	x
rystal River	7274	Crystal River H S	ŝ	x	X	x	9558	Pensacola H S Pensacola II Coll	X	XX	X	X Marietta	9839 S	Strattord Academy	X	X	XX	x
age City aytona Beach	9124	Maniand Sr H S	Â	xx	Â	x ·	0771	Univ of West Fionda	ŝ	212	X	X	8834	Annetta H S	X	X	X y	X
e Funiak Spgs .	8620 9076	Seabrenze Sr H S Watton Sr H S	x	× ×	x	Perry	9125	Taylor County H S	ŝ	212	Î	Norcross	9889	iorcross H S	, X	X	X Ç	Ľ.
e Land	0756 6236	Stetson Univ Defiona H S	x	X X	XX	x Port Charlotte	9299	Port Charlotte H S	Ŷ	^ î		Rome	9103	Rome H S	Ŷ		, x	x
unedin	7030	Dunedin H S Lemon Bay H S	X	XX	X	Port State Joe	7834	Port St Joe H S	^	x	x	Savannah	0786	Amstrong St Coll	2	x i	x x	x
Lauderdale	7735	Cardinal Gibbons H S	X	XX	X	X Punts Gorda X Ouncy	9147 8661	Charlotte H S James A Shanks H S	X	XX	X	1.1.1.1	6613 S	Saint Andrew's School Savanah St Coll	x		1	
3	9556	Fort Lauderdale H S	1.	XXX	X	Saint Augustin	6196 9421	Nease Jr Sr H S St Augustine H S	x	xx	X	Statesboro	0649 5	Savannah Tech Seorgia Southern Univ		X	x	×.
10.10	6206	Prie Grest School	- X		x	y Saint Cloud	8874	St Joseph Academy St Cloud H S -	X	x	X	X Stone Mountain Suwanee	8971 5	Stone Mountain H S	X	x	x	
Meyers .	6664	Riverdale H S		010	X	X Saint Petersbu	9 9157	Admiral Farragut Academy Boca Caroa St H S	X	YY	X	Thomaston :	7232 1	Upson Lee H S	X	x	xx	X
Myers	9688	Edison Comm Coll	Ŷ	XX	Â	x	8774	Duxie Holins H S	ŝ	810	X	Titton	0781	Abraham Baldwin Ag Coll		X	XX	×.
Pierce	0774	Fort Peirce Central H S	X	xx	X	X	6202	Northiside Christian H S	^	12	12	X Valdosta .	0674	aidosta St Coli	×	X	x x	13
Walton Beach	9843 8366	Choctawhatchee H S	X	x	X	Samord	7271	Seminole H S Sanford	x	x	11	X GEORGIA Non	-Saturday	Test Centers"		$ ^{} $		I^I
anesvile	0778	Santa Fe C C	X	XXX	X	X Sarasota	7895	Booker H S Sarasota H S	X	XX	X	X Atianta	7288	Idanta Adventist Acad	~	12	6 10	
ien State Mary	9485	Baker County H S	X	XX	X	Sateline Beach Seminole	8654 9753	Satellite H S Osceola H S	×	XX	X	X	6350	esviva H S of Atlanta	24	H	1	12
wieah	7174	American H S	X	X X	Î	X Soring Hill	7892	Seminole H S	XX	XX	XX	HAWAII	1292	seorgia Cumpenano Acaberri	1 24		-	-1
boowywood	8552	Chaminade Madonna Coll Prep	Ŷ	^	11	X Starke	7194	Brattord County H S		XX	1	X Hana	6837	tana H S	1	L	x1	11
	9549 8139	South Broward H S	X	x	x	X Stuart	9591	South Fork HS	ŝ	Û.		X Hilo Honolulu	7307 1	No H S St Louis School	×	X	x x	x
omestead	9497· 7715	Homestead Sr H S South Dade H S	X	XX		X Talahassee	0726	Florida A & M Univ	ŝ	x x	X	X Hoolehua Kamuela	8909 k	Aolokai H S Sawaii Preparatory Academy		0	x	Π.
udson	9644 6172	Hudson H S	X	XX	x	X	9551	Fiorida St Univ - Leon H S	x	XX	x	X Kealakekus	7313	Conawsena H S		XX		
verness	8457	Citrus H S Island Oxistian School	X	XX	X	X Tampe	8650 9747	Chamberlain H S H B Plant H S	x	XX	x	Laie	0899	Y U Hawaii Campus	ž	X	XX	×
icksonville :	9482	Edward White H S	X	Ĵ	1.1	1.1 1	6394	Hisborough C C Mabry Co Jesuit H S of Tampa	X	XX	XX	X Waluku	9515 5	St Anthony H S	Ŷ	$ ^{} $	Ŷ	11.
1. 1.	0717	Fionda C C Jacksonville	ŝ	ŝŝ	ŝ	x	7806	Tampa Catholic H S Tampa Preparatory School	x	X	x	HAWAII Non-S	aturday Te 7308	st Centers*	24		10	11
	9970	Jean Riceutt Sr H S		x x	Ŷ	x.	0761	Univ of South Flonda	X	XX	X	* IDAHO					-	-
2. 25	6887 9573	Mandarin H S N B Forrest Sr H S	X	x	X	x Tarpon Springs	9759	Tarpon Springs H S	12	ŝ	1x	Arco	7322 8	Sutte Co Middle School .	X	1,1	X	
	8997 9572	The Bolles School . Wilkam M Rames H S	X	XX	X	X	9554	Trusvile H S	â	^ x	1	Borse	0914 8	Borse St Univ	x	x.	x x	x
oter1	9550	Jupiter Sr H S Fonda Keys Comm Coll	X	xx	X	Umatilia	9502 6170	Trenton H S Umatila H S	x		X	X Bonners Ferry	7315 0	Sonners Ferry H S	1	^	x	
eystone Higts	9470	Keystone Heights Jr Sr H S		ž	X	Valrico	6498	Bioomingdale Sr H S Venics H S	X	xx	x	X Caribridge	0916 A 9798 0	Ubertson Coll of Idaho Cambridge H S	X	X	XX	×
ake Butter	7746	Union County H S	X	Ĵ.	ŝ	Vero Beach Wauthuka	7284	Vero Beach Sr H S Harthee County Sr H S	XX	XXX	XX	Gienns Ferry Gooding	9534 0 7331 0	Sienns Ferry H S		x	X	11
ake Mary	9438	Lake Mary H S	Ŷ	Ŷ.	Î	Weikington	6239	Weilington H S	x	X	1	Grangeville	7323 0	Srangeville H S	x	X	XX	
ake Wales	7296	Lake Worth Comm H S	x	xx	1 x		9138	Forest Hill H S	X	X D	12	X Idano Falls	9355	Someville HS	X	X	XX	11
akeland	0744	Parm Beach Comm Coll	x	XX	x	X	8226	The King's Academy	ŝ	x î	10	X Kelogg	9162	Leikogo H S	ŝ	Ŷ	1	×
antana	9666	Lakeland Sr H S Santawoes Comm H S	X	XX	X	X Winter Garden	9704	West Orange HS	Ŷ	x	Â	Lewiston'	0920	ewis Clark St Col	x	X	XX	×
ergo	9099 0737	Largo Sr H S Lava Sumter Comm Coll	XX	XX	X	X Writer Haven	9143	Winter Haven Sr H S	x	xx	x	McCal	7329	AcCal Donnety HS		3	x î	1.1
- 04	9079	Lessburg H S	X	X	X	Winter Park	Saturda	Winter Park HS	×		X	Meridian	9442 9518 8	Mendian H S Bear Lake H S	X	X	XX	×
boowpro	7267	Lyman HS	1 ŝ	XX	13	ADODKA	7279	Forest Lake Academy		12 6		Moscow Mountain Home	0928 1 9459 1	Inv of Idaho Acuntain Home H S	X	X	X	X
lananna	0722	Chipole Jr Coll	â	x x	1x	X Mam Beach	9521 7281	Greater Mam Academy Heixew Academy	24	12	10	12 Orotno	6391 0	Drotino H S	X	x	xx	X
ebourne	6150 72%	Fionda Air Academy Melbourne H S	X	XX	x	× GEORGI	A					Post Falls	9559	ost Fails HS	1ŝ	121	Ĩ	
brakel time	62. 868	Paim Bey H S	X	XXX	X	X Adarsville X Abany	6438 8781	ADartville HS	1x	XX		Rathorum	9419	analand HS	ŝ	121	. 10	
Latta	\$251 7635	Anthop Curley Notre Dame	X	X	x	America	0782	Abeny St Col			1	X Rupert	7326	Anidoka County H S	X	Â	2 X	11
· · · · ·	8352	Gutewer Preparatory School Means Dade C C Kandal Com	X	XXX	X	Athens	9496	Clarke Central H S	X	XX	x	x Sandpoint	8356	Sandpoint Sr H S	×.	X	Ŷ.	
	9153	Mare Edison H S		x C	121	Atlanta '	8961	Benamin E Mays HS	x		X	Soca Springs	7328 5	Soda Springs H S Coll of Southern Idaho	XX	XX	XX	×
1	7493	Mami Sunset Sr H S	Ŷ	X	1X	x	0610	Georgia St Univ	X	XX	X	X Weece	7299	Timberline H S		X		
See	8156 9091	Monsionor Edward Pace H S Our Lacy of Lourdes Academy	X	×	X	x .	8962	Henry Grady H S North Atlanta H S	x	xx	x	X IDAHO Non-Sa X Calovel	7330 C	Gem St Academy		12	10	
1.77577.1 Marine 1.77777	9266 7000	Sent Brendan H S South Mami Sr H S	x	X		X Augusta	9154	Southside Comprehensive H S Augusta Coll	x	XX	XX	X ILLINOIS		and the second			- 10	
lam Beach	8351	Many Beach H S Many Sorings Sr H S	x	XXX	1x	I Barting	085.2	Pane Col	X	XX	1	Aboison	7336	Addison Trail H S	×	11	X	×
ddeburg	9458	Modeburg H S	12	X C	121	X Blackshear	8822	Pierce County H S	x	1	X	Abion	9483	Edwards County Sr H S	۰.	1,1	18	
oncelo	9752	Jefferson Co H S		ŝ Ĵ	ŝ	TOURSWOK	6204	Giynn Academy H S	X	xx	X	X Anne	7338	kina Jonesboro H S	x	x	x x	
ew Pt Richey	9118	Gur H S	11	x x	12	X Camila	8957 9760	Machel Baker H S	x	x	1×	Argo	7335	Visioch Comm H S Vigo Comm H S	x	11	Â	x
111-17-16 (1975)			8°	anaan Beerlina		and the second second		en occasiona na manteni e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	1			Contra and an	west cares		10 an			
1.0	14							13				Contractor on 1	- Parts					. '
	2 - C	N		÷								8.5.1	, ne.,					0
												AL 10.						

185

ACT Test Centers

.

*Non-Saturday test centers are listed at the end of each state. See page 11 for eligibility.

Cny	Code	Test Center	0ct. 23, 1	Dec 11.	Feb 5, 1	Jun 11.	City	Code	Test Center	Oct 23.	Dec. 11.	Apr. 9. 1	Jun 11.	City	Code	Test Center	Oct 23	Dec 11	Feb 5.	
Illinois, cont	9532	Hersey H S	1×1	xI	x D	1×	Decatur	7371 1080	Douglas MacAnnur H S Million Univ	x	x		x	Northlake O Fallon	7449 7428	West Leyden H S O'Fallon Township H S	1.		1	j
luburn	9050	St Viator H S Autorn H S	120		B		Deerfield Des Plaines	7392	Mane Twp H S West	X	X,	۲.	X	Oak Lawn	9052	Oak Lawn Comm H S	x	x	x	ć
lurora	7343	Aurora Cent Catholic H S			į	X	Dixon	6829	Dixon H S Sauk Vatiev Comm Coll	x	×,	(x	X	Oak Park	8737 7451	Fernwick H S Oak Park River Forest H S	x	x	x	ι
	8865	IL Math & Sci Acad .		^	ß	+	Doiton	7396	Thornvidge H S	X	X	i X	x	Oglesby	1056	Minors Valley C C	X	x	X	ţ
	7346	Marmon Military Academy Wauborise Valiev H S	X		B	1x	Downers Grove	7398	Comm H S South	x	x	Ŷ	x	Olympia Fields	7453	Rich Central H S	x			
0.2010.2020	7345	West H S	X	x	ž į	10	0.000	7397	Downers Grove North H S	X	X	X	X	Orland Park	7454	Carl Sandburg H S Ottawa Two H S	x	x	x	ł
Sarrington Sartonville	7348	Barrington H S Limestone Comm H S	Â		13	1	Dwight	6205	Dwight Township H S	1		18	1^	Palatine	1163	Harper Coll	X	x	x	į
Batavia	7349	Batavia Sr H S	X		13		East Peoria	1035	East Peona Comm H S Ilunois Central Coll	X	x	1X	x		7384 8889	Palatine H S William Fremd H S	1			
Beecher	7340	Beecher H S	x		15		East State Louis	7376	East St Louis Sr H S		X	(X	X	Paios Heights	7166	Alan B Shepard H S	X		×	į
Belleville	7474	Altholi Catholic H S Belleville Atea Coli	X	x	x 13	1x	Edwardsville	1147	S1U Edwardsville Cam	x	x	(Â	X	Palos Hills	9054	Amos Alonzo Stagg H S	1	l^	l^	î
1000	7334	Belleville West H 5		0	113	X	Etfingham	7350	Effingham H S Eloin Comm Coll	X	x B	X	X	Paris Park Forest	7456	Paris H S Rich Two H S Fast Camous	X			
serviciere Sensenvilie	9184	Fenton H S		^	16	1		6193	Eigin H S	X	x	X	X	Park Ridge	7458	Mene Twp H S East	X			,
Serwyn	7354	J S Morton H S West	X	x	13	l _x	Elk Grove Vig	7503	Elk Grove H S	X	x	x	Ŷ	Pekin	7461	Pekin Comm H S	Ŷ	x	â	i.
loomington	7355	Bioomington H S	x		XX	12	Eimhurst	7403	York Comm H S Elimented Park H S	X	x	(X)	X	Peoria	0960	Bradley Univ Peopla H S	×		X	ŝ
lue Island *	1044	0 D Eisennower H S	x	x	λ X	X	Eureka	1022	Eureka Coll			X	X		7485	Richwoods H S	X			
Butts	6197	Biults H S			1	ž	Everoreen Park	7405	Evanston Twp H S Everoreen Park H S	X	X		X	Peru T Petersburg	9542	St Bede Academy Porta Jr Sr H S				
Bourbonnais	1112	Oivet Nazarene Univ	11			Ŷ	Fairfield	9547	Fairfield Comm H S		-p	X	12	Piasa	7744	Southwestern Sr H S	X			
Bradley	7358	Bradley Bourbonnais H S Beed Custer H S	X		13		Farmer City	8854	Blue Ridge H S	1		X	^	Plainfield	7661	Plainteid H S	X			
Breese	7359	Mater Dei H S			1		Fiora -	7463	Flora H S	1 X		X		Pontiac	7523	Pontac Township H S Processor H S No 500	X			
Bunker Hill Burbank	5636 5064	Bunker Hill H S Queen of Peace H S	x	x	X	x	Frankin Park	7408	East Leyden H S	Î	1	Ŷ	Ŷ	Ouncy	7466	Quincy Sr H S	Ŷ	x	x	i
A CONTRACTOR	7450	Reavis H S		1	XX	X	Freeport	9169 1029	Highland Comm Coll	x	x	X	x	Richton Park	7457 9116	Rich South H S	X			
ahokia 🗧	6187	Cahokia H S	<u>^</u>		12	1	Galena	6798	Galena HS	12		X	1.	Rever Forest	6449	Trinty H S Holy Cross H S	X			
anton	0961	Spoon River Coll	- Č	X	XX	1 X	Galesburg	7410	Galesburg Sr H S	x	â,	Ŷ	1	HIVE GOVE	8612	Mother Guern H S				
arimville	7361	Carleville H S	X	1		l°.	Geneva	7332	Geneva Comm H S	11		X		Biverside	1151	Triton Coll Exercise Brookfield Two H S	x.			
anyle .	6136	Cartyle H S Carmi White Co H S	11	1	1 Å		Glen Eliyn	7411	Glenbard West H S		x	Ŷ	X	Robinson .	1067	Lincoin Trail Coll	x	x	X	í.
arol Stream	7561	Glenbard North H S			. 3	X	Glenview	9313	Gienbrook South H S	X	xB		X	Rochelle Rock Falls	7471 6859	Rochelie Twp H S Rock Falls Township H S			x	ł
anervia .	1017	John A Logan Coll	Ŷ	x	x x	Â	Gorevile	8390	Goreville H S	X				Rock Island	7472	Aleman H S	1v	. 1		
arthage	8560	Carl Sandburg Coll Ext Ctr Kaskaskia Coll	Y	x	XXX	x	Grayslake	1005	Coll of Lake County	â	x	Ŷ	Ŷ	Rockford .	7367	Boytan Catholic H S	1			
hampaign ir	1154	Univ of Illinois	- X	x	XX	X	Greenville	7246	Bond County Comm Unit 2 H S		+	1v	X	Bochoo	7476	Rockford West Middle School Honogenath Comm H S	×	X	×	į.
harleston	9646 1016	Charleston H S Eastern Illinois Univ	. 1. 1		X	x	Hamsburg	1161	Southeastern Itinois Coll	X	x ,	Ŷ	X	Roling Mows	9314	Rohng Meadows H S	X	x	X	ł
hicago .	7365	Academy of Our Lady	- X		. 3	1	Harvey Havana	7413	Thornton Twp H S Havana H S	x	X J	X	11	Romeoville	9065	Romeoville H S Lake Park H S West	X		1	
1. St. 1. St.	9762	Bogan H S		1	î	x	Highland	7992	Highland H S			X	- V	Roxana	7418	Roxana H S				
	7351	Bowen H S	×	X.	ž i ž	X	Hisboro	9104	Historo H S	â	11	Ŷ	Ŷ	Saint Charles	8996	St Charles H S	l^	1		
	7777	Chicago Vocational H S	1.1	X.	² x	1	Hillside	7270	Proviso West H S	1		X	X	Savanna	7333	Savanna Jr Sr H S Schaumhurn Christian School	x	Y	x	į
	7368	De La Salle Institute Du Sable H S	X	λ.	XXX	x	Hofiman Est	7417	James B Conant H S	1X	x	Ŷ		ounderloony	8682	Schaumburg H S		1	1	í
1. M.	6166	Dunbar Vocational H S		x	. Š	x	Huntley	6867	Huntley H S Ninois Coll	X	xb	ά		Skoke	7480	Niles Twp H S North	x			
\$."	7360	Fenger H S	1		^ x		Internet Car	1068	Macmurray Coll			1.	X	Francis	7483	Niles Twp H S West	X	X	X	ł
5 St 19 1	6652 7366	Francis W Parker School Good Counsel H S	X	1			Joket	9192	Joliet Catholic Academy		<u>î</u>	Ŷ		South Holland	7406	Thornwood H S	X			
1.1	7205	Gordon Technical H S	X	x	XX	1.	kention	1048	Joliet Jr Coll Gallatio Co H S	X	x	X	X	Sparta	8637	Sparta H S Lucoin Land Comm Coll	×	x	x	ł
	7356	H Washington Got (Loop) Hirsch Metro H S			* x	Ŷ	Kankakee	7421	Bishop McNamara H S			X	1.1	0,	6792	Lutheran H S	X	1	1	
1.1	9053	Holy Tranty H S		\$	XX	1.		1053 8431	Kankakee Comm Coll Kankakee H S	X	xp	۲X.	X	1.1	1146	Sacred Heart Onthin H S Springfield Coll in Ninois	x	x	x	1
1. 1. 1.	1040	linois inst of Tech	x	2	xx	Îx	Kewanee	7422	Kewanee H S	ž	. 1	(X	X		9683	Springheid H S	X	X	X	i
	7436	Josephinum H S Kelly H S	X	ξ.	XXX		La Grange Park	7425	Nazareth Academy H S	I^	^	Î	11	Sterling	7486	Newman Catholic H S	x			
1.1	0978	Kennedy King Coll	X	X	XX	X	Lake Forest	7426	Lake Forest H S	X	x		X	Streamwood	7487	Sterling H S Streamwood H S		x		
	7391	Lane Fechnical H S Lindblom Technical H S	x	χ.	x x	x	Lansing	9156	Luther East H S	x	.)	x X	x	Streator	7488	Streator Twp H S		š		
24231	7401	Lourdes H S	X	š1	, 13		Lawrencevile	9543 7429	Parkview Jr H S		1	X	1	Sugar Grove Sycamore	9774	Sycamore Comm H S	1	^	1^	1
1	7505	Luther H S South	Ŷ	X	XX	x	Lemont	8632	Lemont Twp H S		× .	X	1.	Taylomile Tipley Park	7489	Taylorville Sr H S				
Sec. 1	0972	Maconna H S Malcolm X Coli	X	X	XXX		Lincoln	1062	Lincoln Coli	x	1	Ŷ	Ŷ	Uwn	1173	Shawnee Col	X	x	X	í
0.00	5877	Manley H S	X	X	X		Lincoinshire -	7465	Adiai E Stevenson H S Illinois Benedictine Coll	×		XX	X	Vandalia	6893 7510	Vandaka Comm Jr H S	X	×	x	i
	7373	Mother McAuley H S	x	^	x	^		6661	Liste Sr H S	X)	(X	1.	Vienna	9484	Vienna H S		X	1.	į
	7375	Mt Carmel H S Northeastern Binois Liniv	X	X	XXX	X	Lombard	7432	Gienbard East H S	x	x	x	x	Waterioo	7512	Gibault H S	1	1	I^	ĵ
	6704	Notre Dame High School	11	-	X	1	Macomb	7719	Montini H S Western Burges Line	x	x .	X	1x	Waukegan West Chrono	7736	Waukegan H S West Chicago Comm H S	X	x	×	i
Sec. 1	9500	Percy L Julian H S			×	X	Maita	1051	Kishwaukee Coll	1°	1'	1Â	x	West Frankfort	6279	Frankfort Comm H S	X			
	7374	Resurrection H S	X	1	XX		Marshall Mascoutah	6147 9873	Marshall H S Mascoutan Comm H S	x		X	x	westchester	7492	Immac Heart of Mary H S St Joseph H S	x			
a sugar	7524	Sant Francis DeSales H S	Ŷ	x	1 x	1	Mattoon	7433	Mattoon Sr H S	X	X	X	X	Westmont	7257	Westmont H S	1			
10	7353	Saint Gregory H S Saint Martin de Porres Acad	×		X		Maywood	9059	Johnsburg H S	^		x		THINGS COL	7494	Wheaton Comm H S North	x	x	x	i
1	7024	Saint Patrick H S	X	.1	X	12	McLeansboro -	7435	McLeansboro H S	×	x .	X	1	Waterla	7415	Wheeking H S Lovola Academy	x	x	1.	1
	7341	Saint Arta H S Saint Scholastica H S	X	Ŷ.	* X	X	Moine	1082	Black Hawk Coll	x	x	X	x		7495	Regina Dominican H S	X	1		
1. 1.	7379	Senn H S		× 1	× 3	X	Monmouth	7438	Moline Sr H 5 Monmouth Coll	×	× >	X		Winnetka	7497	Www.mington H S New Ther H S	x	x	x	£
2.5	0970	Truman Col	x	x	x x	X	Montoelio	7190	Monticelio H S			X		Wood River	7498	E Alton Wood River H S	1		1	1
38 Y.	1152	Univ of Chicago Univ of IL at Chicago	x	1	X	X	Moms	7439	Morns Comm H S			Ŷ		Zion .	7500	Zion Benton H S	x			
2 A 1 A 1	7470	Weber H S	x	x	X		Morton Mt Carmel	7896	Morton H S Watesh Valley Coll	X		X	X	ILLINOIS Non-Sa	nurde,	Test Conters*				J
hcago Heights	\$500 7382	Bioom H S	x	1	X	X	Mt Prospect	7440	Prospect H S	X		X	X	Chicago	7364	Ida Crown Jewish Academy Shiloh Academy	24	12	6	1
8	9506	Bloom Trail H S	X		XX		Mundeleyn	7441	Mt vernon Township H S Cannel H S	×	x	X	X	in an and the	9495	Univ of Illinois at Chicago	25	13		
	0959	Prane St Coll	â	x	XX	x		7443	Mundelein H S	X	X.	X	X	La Fox	7458	N SUD Synagogue Beth El Broadview Acabemy		12		1
cero	7385	J S Morton H S East	X	X	XXX	Y	wapervile	7201	Naperville Central H S	1	1	X	x	INDIANA	-		-		-	1
ountry Cito His	7575	Hecrest H S	1°I	1	1 x	x	New Lenox	6219	Lincoln Way Comm H S	x		X		Anderson	9338	Anderson H S	X	1	1	
rete Crystal Lake	1075	Crese Monee H S McHenry County Coll	x	X	XXX	X	Nies	7507	Notre Dame H S			x		Arcadia Arcos	9486	Hamilton Heights H S Aroos H S	XX	x	x	ı
lanvile -	1010	Danvile Area Comm Coll	X	x	XX	X	Normal	1042	Ridgewood H S	×		X	x	Aurora	9400	South Dearborn H S		0	X	1
e Kab	7353	De Kalb H S	Ŷ	1	x	1	North Chicago	9552	North Chicago H S	X	× .	X		Bioomington	1210	Indiana Univ	x	x	x	¢
	1102	Northern lienois Univ	- 1 - 1	XI	1 X	1 X	THUR DIG DOM	1441	Second Down Hot SI 71 G	1 A			4	Budtton	9202	Button H S	1.1	X		

4

计学

With the state of the state

	Indiana, cor	it.	· · ·					Council Biulfs	7539	Lincoln H S Thomas Jefferson H S	X	X	×B	<u>i</u> x	Garnett 7 Goodland 7	581	Gamett H S Goodland H S	X	x	1	Π	1 1	
	Carmel	8040	Brownsburg H S Carmel H S	1	^ Ŷ			Creston	1298	Southwestern Comm Coll Central H S	Ŷ	X	хĘ	<u>i</u>	Great Bend 1	387	Barton County Comm Coll Great Bend H S	x	x	X	X.		
	Connersville	7727	Connersvite H S	Ŷ	x	Ŷ	x		7542	Davenport West H S	13	ŝ	ŝįŝ	3 Ş	Hays	408	Fort Hays St Univ	X	XX	X	X		•
	Crown Point	9318 7514	Crown Point H S Culver Academies	1	xx	X			1352	St Ambrose Univ		1	18	<u>۱</u>	Hesston 1	416	Hesston Col	121	χİ.		X		
<u>.</u>	Denville Decatur	9654 8942	Danville Comm H S Beilmont H S		X X		x	De Witt Decorah	9224 1330	Luther Co	x	x	xļź	i x	Hill City 7	587	Hidi City H S	Ŷ	^ ^	1			
# 1	Edinburgh -	6512	Edinburgh H S	L.	ĨX			Denison Des Moines	7543 9081	Denison Comm H S	X		×là	ίx.	Hillsboro 1 Hoton 6	458 853	Tabor Coll Hotton H S	X	x	x			
ŝ.	Elwood	9883	Elwood Comm H S	10	хx	1.	X		1302	Drake Univ Fast H S	X	X	XX	{ ×	Humboldt 7 Hutchiason 1	588	Humboldt H S Hutchinson Comm Coll	x	x x	X		'	
	CASU2ADD	9325	Reitz H S	<u>^</u>		Ŷ			1316	Grand View Coll			^ [`	. Į ŝ	independence i	422	Independence Comm Coll	X.	XX	1X			
		1188	Univ of Evansville Univ of Southern Indiana	X	X X	X	X		7545	Lincoln HS	X	x	2	ſ۱	Jennings 9	196	Jennings H S	2		1Â			۰.
5	Fort Wayne 1.	9317 7520	Homestead H S North Side H S	X	XX	X	X		7547	Roosevelt HS	1X	Ŷ	. 13		Johnson 8	349	Stanton County H S	Ľ)	x	X			
1	Franklin	· 9293 9033	R Nelson Snider H S Franklin Comm H S	X	x I		X	Dubuque •	1328 7550	Loras Coli Wahlert H S	X	X	×	{ ×	Kansas City 1	426	K C Kansas C C +	X	X x	1¢	x	•	
9	Frankport	6616	Clinton Praine Jr Sr H S	.			X	Elonidge Emmetsburg	9179 1308	North Scott H S IA Lakes C C Emmetsburg						590 591	Washington H S Wyandotte H S	X	XXX	1		Ċ	•
9	Current in the second	9395	Wilkem A Wirt School	l^!	X î		x	Epworth	9827	Western Dubuque H S	I.	v.	YX	{ ₁	Kingman 7 Kinsaw 7	593	Kingman H S Kinslev H S	¥.	1		X		
	Greenwood	9378	Center Grove H S		Ŷ			Fairfield	1317	Maharishi Int'i Univ	1Ş	Ţ.	ΨĮ		La Cygne 9	995	Prairie View H S		, ,	X			,
	Hammond	5429	Bishop Nol institute	L.		x		Forest City	1362	Waldorf Coll	10		÷18	ŝĮŝ	Leaverworth 7	598	Leavenworth Sr H S	X	, X				- 14
		1233	Monton Sr H S Purdue Univ Calumet	X	x x	X	x	Politicoge	1312	Iowa Central Comm Coll	ŝ	<u>^</u>	213	ξ x	Leot 9	20	Wichita County H S	X	21.	18	1.1	.•	
	Highland -	7726 7516	Highland H S Howe Military School		XX	×		Fort Madison Gowrie	6833	Praine Valley H S	L.	^	1	X	Lindsborg 1	388	Bethany Col	Ŷ	^ ^	Ŷ	1^1		
}	Indianapolis	8974	Ben Davis H'S Broad Broke H S	X	X X	X	x	Grinnell Hampton	7552 7553	Grinnell Comm H S Hampton Comm H S	X		B	ξĮ x	Linn i 7 Lyons I 6	641 795	Lina H S Lyons H S			X			
· ·.		1214	Indiana Purdua Univ	X	X X	X	x	Harian independence	7554 6247	Harlan Comm H S	X		B	{ X	Manhattan 1 Mankato 7	428 600	Kansas St Univ Mankato H S	X	×	X	*		
		9373	Lawrence North H S	x	l Û x	1ŝ		Indianola kowa City	7555	Indianola Sr H S Begina H S	x	X	x	<u>,</u>	Marysville 7 McPherson	601 440	Marysville H S McPherson Coll	X	x x	XX			
Į.		5582	Pike HS		^ x		x	Koura Falle	1356	Univ of lows Elements Coll	Ŷ	Ϋ́,	x	i l î	Medicine Lodge 7	602	Medicine Lodge H S Mannutton Valley H S	X	1,	X	1	. 1	
		9316 9690	Honcelli H S Southport H S	X		X	x	Johnston	7584	Johnston H S	ŝ	C)	, ŝ	š į ž	Moscow 9	233	Moscow H S	X	χĺ^	X			
1 .		6440 8908	Thomas Carr Howe H S ' Warren Central W S	X	X	x	x	Leke Park	6171	Hants Lake Park H S	I.	Ŷ	^ }	۱ ۲	Mutvane 6	622	Mulvane HS	x	ŝ	1.	x		
	Jasper Jeffersonville	9726 9340	Jasper H S Jeffersonville H S	X	xx	x	x	Lemoni Le Mars	1314 1370	Graceland Coll Tekvo Westmar Univ	X	x	xß	i x	Ness Cdy 7 Newton 8	684	Newton H S	1.1	1	1	x	1.	36
	Kendaliville	8082	East Noble H S Kokomo H S South C	x	X			Manchester	7557 7558	West Delaware H S Maple Valley H S	X		B	8	Norton 7 Olathe 6	609 451	Norton Jr H S Olathe East H S	X	×	x			
1.4	La Porte	9339	La Porta H S	I.	\$ Ç	X	x	Maquoketa	7559 9731	Maquoketz Comm H S	X		3	{ x		296	Olathe North H S Olathe South H S	X	XXX	X	X	۰.	扫描
	Latayette	9271	Jetterson H S	Ŷ	^ ^		x	Marshal-town	1332	Marshalltown Comm Coll .	X	X	XX	Ş	Osawatomie 6 Osborne 7	854	Osawatomie H S	X		X			
	Lagrange	9377	Prairie Heights H S			x		McGregor	9240	Mar Mac H S	I,		٦l	31^	Ottawa 7 Overland Park 1	508	Ottawa H S Interest County C C	X	X X	1x			
1	Lebanon -	7054 6334	Lawrenceburg H S Lebanon H S	X	x			Monticello	7560	Monacello H S	Û			١.	6	422	Watkins Memorial Library 3	8	<u>)</u>	1ŝ	×		
	Lacooid Lincoin City	9693 6808	Perry Central H S Hentade Hels H S	x	X	X		Muscatine	1344	Muscatine Comm Coll	Î X	^	x	2 Î X	Philipsburg 7	610	Philipsburg H S	Ŷ.	21.	10	13		- 11
	Logansport Madison	9649	Logansport H S Madison Consolidated H S		x	X		Newton	7562 9787	Newton H S Norwalk H S	X	x	X X	i x	Pratt	450	Prati Comm Coll	x		Ľ	X.		题
•	Manon	1226	Indiana Wesleyan Univ	x	xx	1 _x	x	Orange City Osage	1346 9600	Northwestern Coll Osage Sr H S	X	X	X X	ίx.	Brverton 5 Sabetha 7	834 040	Riverton H S Sabetha H S	x	x x	X			
	Martinsville	8779	Martinsville H S	Y	X	X		Osceola Oskaloosa	7563 1372	Clarke Comm H S William Peon Coll	x	x	xB	{ x	Saint Francis 6 Salina 1	199 434	St Francis Comm H S Kansas Wesleyan Univ	x	x x	X	x		
	Michigan City	7556	Roost HS	l^	Ŷ	X		Ottumwa	1269	Indian His C C Otturnwa Cam	X	x	xB	{ x	Scott City 7	148 511	St John's Military School Scott Comm H S	X		X			透
	Montezona	9315	Two Lakes H S	x		10		Paullina	6411 1284	South D'Brien H S	X		Ι,	١¥	Shawnee 7	613	Shawnee Mission NW H S	X	x x	x	X	-	1000
	Morocco Mt Vernon	6433	Moron Newton Jr Sr H S Mt Vernon H S	X				Red Oak	7565	Red Oak Comm H S	Ŷ		- 5	40	7	612	Shawnee Mission South HS	X	X X	X			19
{	Muncie.	6814 7517	In Acad Sci, Math, & Humanities Munce Central H S	X	×	X	x	Sheldon	7569	Sheldon Comm H S	X	x	12	٤İŝ	Stiwell 7	651	Blue Valley H S	X.	ΧĮĴ	Ŷ	X		
	New Albany	9890 1229	Muncle Southside H S Indiana Univ Southeast	X	XX	X	x	Sioux Center Sioux City	1276	Bray Cliff Coll	x	x		i î	Topeka 7	617	Highland Park H S	X.	׾^	1			
}	New Haven Oakland City	8897 1228	New Haven H S Calculated City Coll	X	x			1999 - B. 1999 -	7568 7566	East H S North H S	X	X	χj,	E X	1 4	618	Topeka West H S	Ŷ	λĺ.	Ľ	Ľ1		
1.	Peru	9844	Peru HS Portage H S				x	Spencer Stanwood	7570 7549	Spencer Comm H S	X	x	- 13		Tribune 6	474 832	Greeky County H S	X	X I X	1	1		
	Portland	9663	Jay County H S	x	, [^]	1,		Storm Lake	1278 7571	Buene Vista Coll Stuart Menio Sr H S	X	x	×j	{ X	Udall 6 Utysses 7	692 622	Udali H S Kepley School	X	×	x	×		
	Richmond	1216	Induna Univ East	X,	x x	1ŝ	x	Tame	6780 7529	South Tama Co H S North Tama County Comm H S	X			{ x	Wamego 6 Wichta 1	774 412	Warnego H S Friends Univ	X	XXX	X	×	•	
	Seymour	6413	Seymour H S	Ŷ	X	11		Truro	6329 7720	Interstate 35 H S	,	X	<u>، ا</u>	X		629 629	Wichita Heights H S Wichita H S East	X	xI.	×			
	South Bend	1225	Indiana U et South Bend	x	xx	X	x	Washington	7630	Washington H S	Ş	<u>^</u>	ηs	ilî,		625	Wichits H S Southeast	X	x] :	X	١ <u>ڊ</u>		
ľ.	Terre Hauta	\$021 1206	same Joseph & H S Indiana St Univ	ľ	x	X			7572	West KS	ŝ	x	x	<u>۱</u> ^		624	Wichita Northwest H S	ΙÂ.	<u>x x</u>	X	X		
	Vaiparaiso	\$358 7519	Terrs Haute North Vigo H S Valparaiso Sr H S	×	xX	1.1	x	Webster City	1368	iowa Central Comm Coll	Ŷ		Ĵ	31.	1	472	Wichita St Univ	1¥1	ž i š	ĬX	1×1	•	
ų,	Vincennes	1258 8167	Vincennes Univ		x		×.	West Burington West Des Moines	1280	Valley H S	x	Ŷ.	άß	ξĺΧ	KANSAS Non-Satu	nday	Test Centers'	11	^ ^		11		
ž.	West Lafayette Winona Lake	1230	Purdue Univ	1 _x	X x		x	Wetterset	7567	Winterset H S	(X		<u></u>	<u>4</u>	Enterprise 7	582	Enterprise Academy	Ц	1	10	니		•
<u> </u>	Zonsvile	8702	Zionsville Comm H S	Î	^	$\left \cdot \right $	Ŷ	Attamont	7574	Labette County H S	İX.	ĥ	1	1	KENTUCKY	100	Christo County H C	1 1	 	1	, [
	Cicero	7513	Indiana Academy	24		10		Arkansas City Atchison	1384	Cowley County Comm Coll Benedictine Coll	X	X	XB		Alexandria , 9	874	Campbell County H S	1.1	ŝlŝ	1.	1š	s	•
	IOWA	• •						Belot	1451 7576	N Central Kansas AVT Buhar H S	X	X	×,	d	Astrano 2 5	103	Boyd Courty H S	181	ŝľ	ŝ	11	÷.,	•
S.	Algona	7525	Alpone H S lows St Univ	X	XX	X	X	Burington	6890 1395	Burlington H S Neosto Co Comm Coll [®]	I,	X	, þ	ġ,	Barostown 9	552 531	Nelson County H S	181	1	X	14		·· .
	Anamosa	9812	Animosa H S	Î	I, I,	X	x	Clay Center	7577	Clay Center Comm H S	I\$	0	^ \$	40	Banky 6	818 636	Balard Memorial H S	ž	× ×				
ŧ.	Atlantic	1521	Attentic H S	ŝ	Ĵ Ŷ	8	Ŷ	Colby	1399	Colby Comm Coll	ŝ	Ŷ	xþ	dź	Beltry 9 Benton 9	968 872	Bettry H S Marshall County H S	X	XX	X	×		
	Boone and	6711	Boone Comm School	1	1	1ŝ		Columbus	7579	Columbus Unified H S	X		1.	1	Beres 9	323 881	Serie Comm H S Feel Berd Massion School	X	ſ	Ix.	[*]		
	Buttalo Center	6726	North Iowa H S	1X		1 x		Concordia Cunningham	1401 9479	Cloud County Comm Coll Cunningham H S	ľ	Ň	B		Bowing Green 6	851	Bowing Green H S	X.	X X	Y	١ <u>۲</u>		
<u>.</u>	Burlington Cartol	7530 7531	Burlington H S Garrolf Comm H S	X	xx	X	X	Derby Dodge City	7580 1402	Derby H S Dodge Cny Comm Coll	X	X	x),	(X	Cada 7	638	Togs County HS	181	<u>_ </u> ₿	1	11		
ic i	Cecar Falls Cecar Rapids	1322 1275	Univ of Northern Iowa Kinewood Comm Coll	X	XX	X	X	El Dorado Elikhart	1406 7526	Buter County Comm Coll Elknart H S	X	x	×B	gx		500	Campbeltsville Coli	181	x İ î	x	13		
		7522	La Sale H S Recis H S	x	X	x	XX	Elisworth Emporia	7583	Elesworth H S Emogra St Univ	X		۲ľ	1	Carrolton 7	196	Jetterson C C Carrollion Carn	11	Ŷ.	_	1X	•	
	Centroville	7534	Washington H S Indian Hills Comm Coll	X	×	X	x	Fort Scott	1410	Fort Scott Comm Coll Galace H S	X,	x	"Þ	٩î	Cecha 6 Cloverport 6	617 707	Central Hardin H S Frederick Fraize H S	X	x .	ľ			
	Charles City	7536	Charles City Comm H S	Ŷ	X Ş	1\$	X	Garden City	1414	Garden City Comm Coll	ŝ	x	x	s I s	Columbia 1 Corbin 6	522 809	Lindsey Wilson Coll Corbin H S	X	XX	X	X		
200	Consta	1292	Cleans Corper Coll	IŶ.	I Q I Q	12	01	ORIDHER	0005	Galanter pagerian H S	1.4	1	. 17		Covington 9	069	Hoimes H S	11	1	łx	1		

15

1292 Campo Comm

Contin

ed on next page

.

187

the stars

ACT Test Centers

ţ

Non-Saturday test centers are listed at the end of each state. See page 11 for eligibility.

Link Link <thlink< th=""> Link Link <thl< th=""><th>c. 11, 19 c. 11, 19 c. 9, 199</th><th>2 10</th><th>City Code Test Center</th><th>6 5. 19 c. 9. 19</th><th>c 11.</th><th>Tast Carller</th><th>City Code</th><th>111</th><th>. 9, 19</th><th>1.11 2</th><th>Text Center</th><th>City Code</th></thl<></thlink<>	c. 11, 19 c. 11, 19 c. 9, 199	2 10	City Code Test Center	6 5. 19 c. 9. 19	c 11.	Tast Carller	City Code	111	. 9, 19	1.11 2	Text Center	City Code
Officient of the second of the seco	18121212	18	MAINE	2121-	121	Shitten line	1610	2	121	1813	181	Contractu cont
Chances Phile Construction Phile Construction Phile Phile<	1.111	1.	Augusta 7706 Cony H S	2 X X	X	Parkway H S	uer City 9180	X Bossier	1×1	x x	Thomas More Coll X	Crestview Hills 1560
Circhian Bits Damod Lowy (1) C L L L L L L L L L	x x x	×	Bangor 1646 Husson Coll Bath 6251 Hyde School	2 X	1 x	Bunkie H S	v (551 0e 7743	x Bunkie	X	X x	South Oldham H S X	Crestwood 9416 Cumberland 1555
Charder Till Der Lower	X .		Bernel 7747 Gould Academy	V.	11	Andrew Jackson H S	mette 7688	X Chaimet	X	XX	tamison County H S X	Synthiana 9651
Dr. Mage No.2 Sec.	0		Ekot 6762 Marshwood H S Freeport 8917 Pine Tree Academy	x x	x	Cowngton H S	ngton 9564	Covingt	1 X	XX	Soyle County H S X	Danivike 9758 7642
Diameter Diameter	X		North Bridgton 6870 Bridgton Academy	X	X	Saint Paul School	6685	X	121	1812	Srant County H S . X	bry Ridge 7643
Constructure Listensing Constructure Constructure <td> x</td> <td></td> <td>Skowhegen 8932 Skowhegen Area H S - South Benwick 7712 Benwick Academy</td> <td>Ŷ</td> <td>x</td> <td>Crowley H.S</td> <td>Ney 9658</td> <td>Crowley</td> <td>X</td> <td>XXX</td> <td>kzabethtown Comm Coll X</td> <td>Dizabethiown 1513 7644</td>	x		Skowhegen 8932 Skowhegen Area H S - South Benwick 7712 Benwick Academy	Ŷ	x	Crowley H.S	Ney 9658	Crowley	X	XXX	kzabethtown Comm Coll X	Dizabethiown 1513 7644
Number Processing Processing<			MARYLAND	X	X	Notre Dame H S	8905 9558	X De Dist	X	XX	kzabethtown C C Ctr X	ort Knox · 1493
1213 Team mining is is is is is is is is is is is is is	IxIxIxIx	1r	Arrowd 1678 Anne Arundel Comm Col	x x	X	Denham Springs H S	am Springs 8423	y Denham	1 X	X X	Highlands H S X	ort Thomas 9666
Component Discontinue 10:00 Component Discontinue 10:00 Discontin	XXXX	X	Baltimore 1684 Catonsville Comm Coll	, X ,	1.S	Ascension Catholic H S	idsonville \$341	X Donaids	11	XX	Vestern Hills H S X	7631
Bargeon Bargeon <t< td=""><td>X X X</td><td>1</td><td>6486 Mergenthaler H S 6487 Watbrook H S</td><td>1 x</td><td>11</td><td>Downswie H S</td><td>nsville 6681</td><td>x Downsv</td><td> X </td><td>XX</td><td>Scott County Sr H S</td><td>beorgetown 1514</td></t<>	X X X	1	6486 Mergenthaler H S 6487 Watbrook H S	1 x	11	Downswie H S	nsville 6681	x Downsv	X	XX	Scott County Sr H S	beorgetown 1514
Oriented Hardbarg 125 Decknorg (Sort) 15 1 1 1 Interfactor Hardbarg 125 Decknorg (Sort) 15 125 Interfactor Hardbarg 125	X X		Bel Air . 7723 Bel Air H S	, X.	1.1	East Beauregard H S	Creek 6423	X Dry Cree	X	XX	asgow H S X	Hasgow 7647
Intered Intered <t< td=""><td></td><td>b</td><td>Bettsville 6398 High Point H S</td><td>^ x '</td><td>1 x</td><td>Farmervile H S</td><td>erville . 7687</td><td>X Farmery</td><td>1x</td><td>XX</td><td>Auhienberg South H S X</td><td>ireenville - 7639 tarned - 7649</td></t<>		b	Bettsville 6398 High Point H S	^ x '	1 x	Farmervile H S	erville . 7687	X Farmery	1x	XX	Auhienberg South H S X	ireenville - 7639 tarned - 7649
Name 1000 Name 1000 Name 1000 Name 1000 Name Name <th< td=""><td>XXX</td><td>X</td><td>Cambridge 9282 Cambridge S Dorchester H S</td><td>X·X</td><td></td><td>Ferriday H S</td><td>day 6463</td><td>X Ferniday</td><td>X</td><td>XX</td><td>Aercer County H S - X</td><td>tarrodsburg 8850</td></th<>	XXX	X	Cambridge 9282 Cambridge S Dorchester H S	X·X		Ferriday H S	day 6463	X Ferniday	X	XX	Aercer County H S - X	tarrodsburg 8850
Interchang 1133 Interchang 1135 Interchang	x x x x	12	College Park 1745 Univ of Maryland Columbia 1703 Howard Comm Coll	1 x	X	Frankinton H S	kinton 9171	x Franklin	X	X x	tazard Comm Coll	lardiord 7650
Difference Difference <thdifference< th=""> Difference Differen</thdifference<>	J		6645 Oakland M4Is H S	1 X	X	South Lafourche H S	ano 8940	X Galiano	X	XX	senderson Comm Coll X	ienderson 1557
Display Tele Properties Tele Properties <thtele properties<="" th=""> Tele Properies</thtele>	1^1^1^1	- l^	Damascus 6895 Damascus H S	x x	X	Grambling St Univ	ibling 1582	Gramble	12	1 X	A Rue County H S X	signand Hts 1500 sodgenville 9933
Nome Nome Nome Nome Nome Nome Nome Nome Nome No No <td>1, , , , ×</td> <td>1.</td> <td>Denton 6769 Wesleyan Christian School</td> <td>XX</td> <td> X </td> <td>H L Bourgeois H S</td> <td>9439 here 913</td> <td>X Gray</td> <td>X</td> <td>XX</td> <td>iopkinsville Comm Coll X</td> <td>topkinsville 1569</td>	1, , , , ×	1.	Denton 6769 Wesleyan Christian School	XX	X	H L Bourgeois H S	9439 here 913	X Gray	X	XX	iopkinsville Comm Coll X	topkinsville 1569
Inst. Dist. Dist. <th< td=""><td> x x ^ x</td><td>- 19</td><td>Frederick 6472 Frederick H S</td><td>XXX</td><td>X</td><td>Hammond H S</td><td>mond 6708</td><td>x Hammor</td><td>^</td><td>x x</td><td>Smon Kenton H S</td><td>ndependence 9905</td></th<>	x x ^ x	- 19	Frederick 6472 Frederick H S	XXX	X	Hammond H S	mond 6708	x Hammor	^	x x	Smon Kenton H S	ndependence 9905
Landborn Link	UX X	· .	Garbersburg 6561 Watkins Mill H S	X X Y	1X	Southeastern La Univ Campus	1608	Hanney	0	0	ineldon Clark H S 0	nez 7637
Langton 2013 Byan Samo 2/16 S x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x	x x x x	Ĵ,	Haperstown 7734 North Haperstown H S	X	11	Haughton H S	hton . 9733	X Haughto	1 x	^ ×	Interson County H S	awrenceburg 6749
1:50: 1:50: <td< td=""><td>X X</td><td></td><td>La Plata 1685 Charles County Comm Coll</td><td>XX</td><td>11</td><td>Alen J Elender Mam H S</td><td>of 7692</td><td>y Hourse</td><td>1.1</td><td>1.1.</td><td>Rivan Station Sr H S X</td><td>exington 9075</td></td<>	X X		La Plata 1685 Charles County Comm Coll	XX	11	Alen J Elender Mam H S	of 7692	y Hourse	1.1	1.1.	Rivan Station Sr H S X	exington 9075
c. E22 Function E32 X X X X X X X X X X	x x x		Oxon Hill 7738 Oxon Hill Sr H S V	XXX	11	Vandebit Catholic H S	7702	x .	Î	x x	axington Comm Col	1,11 1531
113.1 113.2 11 <	X X X	1	Parkton 6705 Hereford H S	X		Jennings HS	7693	X Jennino	1.1	XX	aul Laurence Dunbar H S X	6238
Lookan Charlow (1997) Lookan Charlow (1997)	X X	ŝ	Prince Frederick 9639 Calvert H S	XX		Jonesboro Hodge H S	store 7883	X Jonesto	1x	XX	ransylvania Univ	5 53 455 1550
Chronis Direction Direction <thdirection< th=""> <thdirection< th=""> <thdir< td=""><td>XXXXX</td><td>X</td><td>Salisbury 1760 Wor-Wic Comm Coll</td><td>XXX</td><td>X</td><td>Block H S Acadiana H S</td><td>svile 7656 9715</td><td>X Jonesvill</td><td>X</td><td>XX</td><td>key of Kentucky</td><td>1554</td></thdir<></thdirection<></thdirection<>	XXXXX	X	Salisbury 1760 Wor-Wic Comm Coll	XXX	X	Block H S Acadiana H S	svile 7656 9715	X Jonesvill	X	XX	key of Kentucky	1554
Louise Title Law College Title Line College Title Line College Title Line College Line College <thline college<="" th=""> Line College</thline>	x x	ŷ	Towson 8864 Towson H S	XXX	11	Univ of Southwestern La	1612	x	x	^	ionth Laurel H S X	ondon 6576
Laborene iso between de gran d	X	- 3	Upper Martboro 6874 Largo H S	XX,	X	Lagrange Sr H S McNeese St Univ	Charles 7690	Lake-Ch	X	XX	outh Laurel H S X	7655
Hoto Dealer Constrained X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	XXX	1^	7750 Wheaton HS	XX	X	Sam Houston H S	9578	x	X	x x	alard HS X	Duisville 3350
The second sec	1111	11	MARYLAND Non-Saturday Test Centers"	- X	11	Lake Providence Sr H S -	Providence \$719	X Lake Pro	X	XX	elarmine Coll X	1490
Line Total And Pis X	12 10	1.	Hagerstown 7733 Highland View Academy	XXX	X	Lutcher H S	wr 9023	X Lutcher	12	I x I x	Measure Ridge H S	7869
Processor Sets Marry Hills X X Mit Massing Hills X X Mit Massing Hills X X X Mit Massing Hills X <	141 1.119	10	HACCACULICETTC	xXX		Mandeville H S De Soto Parish Mat'l Otr	Seville \$351	v Mansfel	1X	1. I.	ant Xavier HS	7098
9635 Trum H S X <td< td=""><td>IxI I Ix</td><td>11</td><td>MASSACHUSEIIS</td><td>X</td><td></td><td>Many H S</td><td>8895</td><td>Many</td><td>1X</td><td>x x</td><td>outhern HS X</td><td>7 7654</td></td<>	IxI I Ix	11	MASSACHUSEIIS	X		Many H S	8895	Many	1X	x x	outhern HS X	7 7654
1230 Unspirate 1230 Unspirat 1230	^ x x ^	11	Briogewater 1900 Briogewater St Col	XXXX	X	Marksville H S	sville 7258	X Marksvill			mmy H.S	9653
Macksonnie Triss Macksonnie Common X	V VX		Burington 6635 Burington H S	116	1.1	Alfred Bonnabel H S	ine 9621	Metaine	12	1 X X	Vaggener H S X	7658
Machaeler Size	x x x	Ŷ	Groton 9946 Lawrence Academy	XXXX	X	Archbishop Chapelle H S Archbishop Rummel H S	7696	×	1.1	XX	Aadisonville Comm Coll X	Adisonville 1533
Maryind File Dire Dire <thdire< th=""> Dire Dire <</thdire<>	XXXXX	X	Lexington 6105 Lexington H S	XXX	X	East Jefferson H S	7698	1.1	11	x x	Day County H S	Aanchester 7650
Jurynik 157 Jurynik Campode 953 Menik HS X <th< td=""><td></td><td>1°</td><td>Northfield 7737 Northfield Mt Hermon Sch</td><td>^ (X)</td><td>11</td><td>Minden H S</td><td>en 9651</td><td>x Minden</td><td>11</td><td>XX</td><td>waves County H S</td><td>Asyfield 9708</td></th<>		1°	Northfield 7737 Northfield Mt Hermon Sch	^ (X)	11	Minden H S	en 9651	x Minden	11	XX	waves County H S	Asyfield 9708
And/destorg Testel Modestorg Testel Testel Testel </td <td>X X X</td> <td></td> <td>Reading 6510 Reading Memorial H S</td> <td>V X 2</td> <td>X</td> <td>Neville H S</td> <td>00 9953</td> <td>X Monroe</td> <td>X</td> <td>XX</td> <td>Arvaville Comm Coll X</td> <td>Aaysvile : 1527</td>	X X X		Reading 6510 Reading Memorial H S	V X 2	X	Neville H S	00 9953	X Monroe	X	XX	Arvaville Comm Coll X	Aaysvile : 1527
Midenborg T 6623 Likenborg T 663 Morray T X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	x î	12	Salem 1910 Salem St Coll	x x B	1 x I	Outonta Christian H S	6203	 102 	11	X	Addesboro H S X	Aiddlesborg 7664
Morthand 1532 Morthan	X X	X	Stieffield 9511 Berkshire School *	XXX	X	Ouechita Parish H S	9073	1.1	X		Adersburg Military Institute X	Aliersburg 5 6623
Concense Statement Col H S X <td>X X</td> <td>X</td> <td>Wareham 6694 Wareham H S</td> <td>^ <u>x</u> '</td> <td>11</td> <td>Avoyales H S</td> <td>auville . 6159</td> <td>Moreaus</td> <td>X I</td> <td>XXX</td> <td>Acrehead St Univ . X</td> <td>Aorehead 1530</td>	X X	X	Wareham 6694 Wareham H S	^ <u>x</u> '	11	Avoyales H S	auville . 6159	Moreaus	X I	XXX	Acrehead St Univ . X	Aorehead 1530
Onesda 6110 Devela Bjosti Institute X <t< td=""><td>× ×</td><td>1*</td><td>West Roxbury 9513 Catholic Memorial H S</td><td>JĂ</td><td>H I</td><td>Morgan City H S</td><td>an City 6458</td><td>X Morgan</td><td>X</td><td>x T</td><td>essamine Co H S X</td><td>icholasville 9791</td></t<>	× ×	1*	West Roxbury 9513 Catholic Memorial H S	JĂ	H I	Morgan City H S	an City 6458	X Morgan	X	x T	essamine Co H S X	icholasville 9791
x 7 7665 Demass County H S x X X X X X	X	12	Winchester 6619 Winchester HS	x x ,	x	Northwestern St Univ	httoches 1600	Natchito	1 X	x X	neda Baptist Institute X	meida 6110 Invension 1498
B379 Clearabort Status J C X		11	Wordester 1/8/ Becker Los	X X Y	X	New Iberia Sr H S	Iberia - 7705	New De	X	XX	tavess County H S X	7666
Owngreie 6108 Batt County HS X <td>24 12</td> <td>2</td> <td>So Lancaster 7758 South Lancaster Academy</td> <td>^ Ŷ </td> <td>11</td> <td>Cabrini H S</td> <td>9588</td> <td>X I MEN OIR</td> <td></td> <td>X</td> <td>wensboro Business J G X</td> <td>5579</td>	24 12	2	So Lancaster 7758 South Lancaster Academy	^ Ŷ	11	Cabrini H S	9588	X I MEN OIR		X	wensboro Business J G X	5579
Pational 1338 Pational X <thx< th=""> X X</thx<>	12 10	-	Stoneham 7759 Greater Boston Academy	×	X	De La Salle H S	7699	X	X		Sath County H S	wingsville 6108
Parts 78/7 Burnon County HS X <thx< th=""></thx<>			MICHIGAN	^ ŷ '	11	Hoty Cross School	7914	×	×	XX	soucah Comm Coli X	aducah 1538 Tertevile 7665
Parama End 21 Address 2 X	1.1.1.1.	ା.	Addison 9746 Addison H S	XXXX	X	Jesut HS	7700	x	1.1	1010	icurbon County H S X	aris 7667
Prevenie 7665 Bet Courty HS X	12 ^ 1^ 12	- I â	Adhan 1954 Adhan Coll Albon 7791 Albon Sr H S	x x j	x.	McDonogh 35 Sr H S	7091	x · · · ·	X	XXX	ward HS A	1540
Pool Result 7/28 Provide // Society X <t< td=""><td>X X X</td><td>X</td><td>Alien Park 7760 Alien Park H S</td><td>× X</td><td>1.</td><td>Saint Augustine H S</td><td>9560</td><td>S</td><td>X</td><td>X</td><td>et County H S X</td><td>nevile 7668</td></t<>	X X X	X	Alien Park 7760 Alien Park H S	× X	1.	Saint Augustine H S	9560	S	X	X	et County H S X	nevile 7668
Presidentizing 1647 Presidentizing Comm Coll X X X X X Solution Provided States of Appendix Comm Coll X X X X X X Solution Provided States of Appendix Comm Coll X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	x x x	1 a	Aima 1958 Aima Coll	x x)	X.	Southern Univ at N O	1611	14	x	1 X	Ace Lloyd Coll Y	1004 Passes 15/0
mmonton rpr1 taberes (cutry H 5) X	XXXX	X	Alpena 1960 Alpena Comm Coli	XXX	X	Univ of New Orleans	1591	×	X	XX	vestonsburg Comm Coll X	restonsburg 1541
Bussheline 7972 Descentient H 5 X<	XXXX	1	9191 Pioneer HS	1x	11	"Oak Grove H S	Grove 7055 *	X Oak Gro	X.	xx	astern Kentucky Univ - X	ichmond 1512
and Learning Tot, and Learning Look X	XXXX	X	2067 Wasttenew Comm Coll	XXX	X	Oexdele H S	ale 9022	Oskdale	11	X	Lasefinite H S X	usselville 7672
Shelpyone 7073 Delicy Comm H 5 X </td <td>^ ^ x *</td> <td>1</td> <td>Baidwin 6820 Baidwin H S</td> <td>XX</td> <td>11</td> <td>Pearl River HS</td> <td>River 9025</td> <td>Pearl Re</td> <td></td> <td>XX</td> <td>Algorith County H S 2</td> <td>ave Cathanne 1542 aversville \$490</td>	^ ^ x *	1	Baidwin 6820 Baidwin H S	XX	11	Pearl River HS	River 9025	Pearl Re		XX	Algorith County H S 2	ave Cathanne 1542 aversville \$490
Cardinal ranker Construct			Bath 6894 Bath H S	XXX	1x1	Louisiana Coli	1586	Previe	X	XX	medy County H S X	helpyville 7673
Somerset 1970 Somerset Communit Comin Coll X <td< td=""><td>x x x x</td><td>2</td><td>1964 Kekop: Comm Col</td><td>X</td><td>111</td><td>Plaquemine Sr H S</td><td>emine 8697</td><td>X Plaquer</td><td>11</td><td>x</td><td>KOTTO BURTI H S</td><td>7783</td></td<>	x x x x	2	1964 Kekop: Comm Col	X	111	Plaquemine Sr H S	emine 8697	X Plaquer	11	x	KOTTO BURTI H S	7783
Automating Total provem config frag. A A A X X X X A X X X X X X X X X X X			B406 Laxeview HS	XXX	X	Ponchatouta H S	Alen 2054	X Ponchas	X	XX	omerset Comm Coll X	omerset 1570
Versalies 7844 Woostrop County H S X <td>x ·</td> <td>1x</td> <td>Beaver Island 9158 Beaver Island Comm Sch</td> <td>Ŷ</td> <td></td> <td>Port Sulphur H S</td> <td>Suphur, 7701</td> <td>X Port Sup</td> <td>11</td> <td>1</td> <td>mus County H S</td> <td>anceburg - 9965</td>	x ·	1x	Beaver Island 9158 Beaver Island Comm Sch	Ŷ		Port Sulphur H S	Suphur, 7701	X Port Sup	11	1	mus County H S	anceburg - 9965
ministrong reiz ministrong ri b Ar A X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X			Betare 9012 Betare HS	XXXX	X	Louisiana Tech Univ	on 1588	X Ruston	11	XX	woodford County H S - X	ersalies . 7844
Witchester 7876 Gaorya Rogen Dant H S X <thx< th=""> X X <</thx<>	ÎX Î	12	1976 Laxe Michgen Col	11		St Amant H S	Amant 9176	x Sant An	X.	x x	Amoenand Coll	Vikiamsburg, 1510
KENTUCKY Non-Bauedey Test Centers* Z X	XXX	X	Benzonia - 7902 Benzie Co Central H S	X X X	X	St Marbhville Sr H S Rannst Christian Col	Marbrielle 7776	X Saint Ma	1 P	X	worge Rogers Clark H S X	Vinchester 7675
Lasregion Is3/ Umm of nembody 24 12 8 10 12 6991 Far Park. X X X Terminopaim 7700 Search HS X X To Search HS X X X To Search HS X X X X To Search HS X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	X X	x	Bo Rapida 1994 Fems St Univ	XXX	X I	Centenary Col	1 1576		1.1		Test Conters*	ENTUCKY Non-Saturd
LOUISIANA Aborne Batt Wenter Cattock H 6 X X X X X X State Store Store H 5 X X X X X X State H 5 X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	XXXXX	X	Brimingham 7904 Seahom H S	X 3		Green Cake Laboration H 8	6591	2	101	12 6	Inv of Louisville 24	Dusvile 5454
Loopene Boo Wemsion Cattoolc H S X	x x x	x	7765 Lanear HS -	XXX	X	Louisiana St Univ in Shreveport	1593	1	-			OUISIANA
Superior Superior X			7903 Marian H S	X		Woodlawn H S	9207	X	1x1	x x	wmilion Catholic H S I x I	DORYIN BACZ
Cess Buttorn III A	X X	X	Cadeac 7765 Cadeac Mode School	X		Sidel H S	7678	× .	X	1.1.	acuandria Sr H S	lexandria \$342
Anda 6454 Amile 5 X	X X	X	Canton 7321 Phymouth Canton H S	Y N.	1,1	Sterlington H S	ngton 7623	X Sterlingt	X	XX	A St U at Alexandria	7685
terror the service of the service o	x x x x		Cass Oty 7768 Cass City H S	xxx	171	Sulphur H S	9021	X Suphur	X	X	mme HS X	mita 6456
Bastrop 7585 Bastrop HS X X X X X X X X Weah 7724 Weah HS X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	XXXX	X	Centreville . 1999 Gien Daks Comm Coll	XXXX	X	Nicholis St Univ	daux 1580	X Thiboda	1 x	xx	Hexar H S . Y	aker 9542
Ballon mouger 11 Ballon mouger 11 Ballon 11 Ballon 11 Ballon 11 Ballon Pantan Pantan AXXXXXX Cannoon 6645 Cannoon HS	x x x	1 ŝ	Chelses 9007 Chelses H S	10		Weish H S	h 7724	X Weish	X	XX	estrop H S	astrop 7689
	X V	X	Clawson 6645 Clawson H S	XXX	X	NE LA U Franklin Parish	1609	Waner	12	^ X	atholic H S X	aun houge 9055
Stal Central H S X V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V	x 1 x	3	Coloma 7772 Coloma H S	4 100	1,2	Deinado Como Col	Oreans 0404	Non Con	X	1.1.	ALCE HS	9148
1500 Louisen SUIDer A A A Streeton 221 Canenan Col 12 10 Demom 7816 Dwe Child H S	X X V		Dearborn 7814 Dwne Child H S	10	12	Centenary Col	1001 9251	Shrevep	1 x	^ ×	Dusiana St Univ	1590
6656 Permene Baptin 16 X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	IX X X X	19	2006 Henry Ford Comm Coll					Č.	X	XX	where we happend the State of the second sec	6696
in many lot laters	2 IA		And the second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second			1	- Alexandre -	1000			- IXI	0100
16 Continued on next page		*	Continued on next page			16			- 8C	2	· .	

188

ACI	lest	centers							NO	n-34
X - Test	Cénter	is open for	that t	est	da	le.	0		See your	cou
City	Code	Test Center	·.	Cet. 23, 1993	Dec. 11, 1993	eb 5, 1994	Npr. 9. 1994	hun. 11, 1994	City	Cox
Michigan, Deckervie Decon	cont. 7774 De 7789 De	ckervite H S ton Kellogg H S		ĺ,	1		XX		New Baltimore	203 903 780

معاديدة القرار معديدها والاعتقاد محمد المارية والمعادية مريد معرار فالمراجع والمراجع

という。 物化の 和なた。 和なた。

-Saturday test centers are listed at the end of each state. See page 11 for eligibility. counselor for the test date.

City	Code	Test Center	ct. 23, 1990	AC. 11, 198	N. 9. 1994	City	Code	a Test Center	ct. 23, 199	ec. 11, 195	pr. 9. 1994	m. 11, 195	City	Code	Test Center	kt 23, 199	Nec. 11, 195	eb. 5, 1994	pr 9, 1994	un. 11, 196
Michioan, c	tont.		181	õ la	1212		2034	Muskegon Comin Col	1	X		X		6471	Coon Rapids Sr H S	X		T	1	X
Deckerville	7774	Deckervite H S	1.		X	New Baltimore	9036 7807	Muskegon H S Anchor Bay H S	X	x	XX	1X	Crookston Detroit Lakes	7838	Detroit Lakes H S	Â	â	x	x	x
eton	7238	Cass Technical H S	1	x	x x	Newberry	7306	Newberry H S	X	Y	X		Duiuth	6390	Duluth Central H S Univ of Mins Duluth	X	X	X	x	XX
	7773	Denby H S	X			Oak Park	8059	Academy of Detroit H S	1 x	2	X	X	Eagan	6775	Eagan H S	12	01	<u>_</u>	X	0
	7237	Henry Ford H S		xj	(X	Channel	7809	Oak Park H S	1 x		X	Y	Eden Prairie Eduna	7856	Eden Praine H S Eduna H S	Ŷ	1X	x	λ.	X
이 이 안	6662 7301	Kettering H S Mackenzie H S	x			Orvet	2042	Orivet Coll	1X		X	x	Elk River	8735	Elk River Sr H S			1	ž I	
and a second	2024	Marygrove Coll .	121	5	XX	Ontonagon -	7310	Ontonagon Area H.S	X		X	x	Fairmont	7842	Fairmont Sr H S Faribault H S	â	1^		2	ſ
	7761	Redford H S	Ŷ		xx	Oscoda	7810	Oscoda Area H S	X	1	X	X	Farmington	7843	Farmington H S	v.	\$	1	š.	
1.02	7300	Southwestern H S			X	Otsvile -	6145 7317	Laxaville H S Otseco H S	Ŷ	^	Ŷ	1	Findley	9996	Topho Grace H S	L^	2	Ŷ	x	â
	2060	Univ of Detroit Mercy	X	xx	(x x	Owosso	9167	Dwosso H S	X	X		X	Glenwood	7845	Minnewaska H S	X		x	×	
	2064	Wayne St Univ	1.	XZ	XXX	Datord Paw Paw	7318	Dictord H S Paw Paw H S	Ŷ		X	1^	Grand Rapids	9796	Christian Comm School	x	x	Ŷ	x	X
ster	6720	Dexter HS	x.	1	Ŷ X X	Petoskey	2037	No Central Michigan Coll	Š	X	(X	X	Granite Falls	9633	Granute Fails Clarkfid H S	X			X	
wagiac .	2055	Southwestern Michigan Coll	X	x	XXX	Pinconning	7320	Pinconning Area H S	11		x		Hibbing	2116	Hibbing Comm Col	X	X	X	X	,
st Lansing	2032	Michigan St Univ	X	XX		Plainwell	\$883 7812	Planwell H S Protec Central H S	x	x	(x	1 Š	Hutchinson Int 1 Falls	7850	Hutchinson H S Falls H S	Ŷ	1^	Ŷ	â	
canaba	2071	Bay De Noc Comm Coll .	X	x	1 X X	Port Huron	2045	St Clair Co Comm Coll	x	x	(x	1X	inver Grove Hts	2103	Inver Hills Comm Coll		X		š	
rmington	7778	Farmington H S	X	XX		Portland	9190	Portland H S Detroit Carb Cent H S	1 X		Ŷ	1 Å	Ivanhoe	6270	Lincoln Hi Public School			x	^	x
rmington Hills	\$357 \$347	Marnson H S Marcy H S	x		x x	1.000	6655	Lee M Thurston H S	1	X	10	11	Lake Crystal	8522	Lk Crystal Welicome Mem H S			1	X.	
ncon	7790	Lake Fenton Comm School	1.	XX		Reed City Riverview	9583	Riverview Comm H S	Ы		x		Little Falls	7855	Little Falls Comm H S	L^	x	x	x	1
nt.	1996	C S Mort Comm Coll	Ŷ	XX	x x x	Rochester	2033	Dakiand Univ	X	X	X	Ş	Luverne	6243	Luverne H S Mankato St Univ	XX	x	x	xI	x
	7779	Carman Answord: HS Central HS	XX	XXX	XXX	Bogers City	7409	Rogers City H S	X		x	11	Mapleton	8201	Maple River Schools	10		.1	š	
5 6	7780	Northwestern Comm H S	1	1	X	Romeo	7537	Romeo H S -	X	2.	XX	11	Medford	6213	Marshall or right Medlord H S	1	1^	1	Ŷ	1
1.1	9311 7784	Southwestern Academy H S			x x	Royal Cak .	8985	George & Dondero H S	X	X	X	X	Mairose	7390	Mekose Sr H S	1			×	
wierville	7823	Fowlervie H S			v X	Seconaw	7817	Shrine H S Buena Vista H S	â	â.	(ÎX	â	Minneapolis	6727	Boys & Girls Club of Minneapolis	Ŷ		x	x	X
tser	7268	Fraser H.S	X		Ŷ		9914	Valley Lutheran H S	Š		X			9278	Breck H S	X	x	x	x	x
Inom	6417	Newsyoo Co Career Tech Ctr	X		Y	Saint Johns	7592	St Johns H S	1X			x	100	2147	Minneapolis Comm Coll	X	X	x	x	X
Cies	6223	Gookes H S	1		x x	Saint Joseph	7819	St Joseph H S	×	X	(_Y	X		7859	Minnehaha Academy North North Comm H S	X		x	1	5
and Bianc	8622	Grand Blanc H S	x		X x	Sanford 1	9989	Mendian H S	X		X	1	3.5	2137	North Hennepin C C		x	x	x	2
and Rapids	7026	Catholic Central H S	101			Saugatuck Saug Sta Maria	8727	Saugatuck H S	1 X	x	Â	x		9095	The Blake School	1			x	Ĉ
	1981 7770	East Grand Rapids H S	x		1 x	Scottvile	2075	West Shore Comm Coll	X	X	C X	X	a	2156	Univ of Minnesota	X		X	ž	X
	7908	East Kentwood H S	X	XX		Sidney South Haven	2029	Montcalm Comm Coll South Haven L C Mohr H S	1 X		X	1	Minnetonka .	7849	Hopkins H S	î			2 I	â
	6752	Grand Rapids Christian H S	Ŷ	x	XX	Southfield	2020	Lawrence Technological Univ	X	š	X	X	Manual Lideo	7841	Minnetonka H S	X	1 X		¥1	×
	2004	Grand Rapids Comm Coll	X	XX		Southgate	7820	Aguinas H S Southgate Anderson H S	Ŷ	X	â	â	Moorhead	6488	Moortwad Sr H S	Ŷ	11		x.	1
- a - 10	7803	Union H S	x	x	x x	Sterling Heights	7821	Adial Stevenson H S	X				Hare .	2134	Moornead St Univ	X	x	×	ži	*
	7023	West Catholic H S			XXX	Stevensville	9258	Lakeshore HS			1^	2	Morris	2155	Univ of Minn Morris	X		X	x	i.
case Ple Wds	9016	Grosse Pointe North H S	X	XX	(x x	Stockoridge	7616	Stockbridge H S	1.		X	1.	New Hope	6118	Robbinsdale Cooper H S	X			x	ð
He Works	7287	Hale H S .	1 X	xx		Tawas City	7633	Tawas Area HS	r'		x	11	New Prague	9783	New Prague Sr H S			1	X	
	6358	Regina H S	10.	1	X.	Taylor	7269	John F Kennedy H S	X	¥.	X	X	Northfield	7855	Northfield Sr H S B O L D H S	Ŷ	1	^	x	
mison	1973	Mid Michigan Comm Coll Hart H S	1 X		X X	Temperance	7620	Bedford H S	X	X	X	X	Ortonville	9206	Ortprivile H S	x		1	-	X
stings	7852	Hastings H S	X		X	Traverse City	2040	Northwestern Michigan Coll Trenton H S	×.	×	(XX	X	Osakis Owatonna	7857	Osakis H S Owatonna H S	x	x		Ŷ	x
mand Park	7801	Millord H S Highland Park H S	X	x	1 X X	Troy	7884	Troy H S	X		X		Park Rapids	7895	Park Rapids H S	X	X		š	X
man +	6416	Hisman H S		2	X V	University Center	7925	Vassar H S	1 X	*	Ŷ	11	Pine City	6210	Pine City H S		1		2	ĺ.
scale ,	7811	West Ottawa H S	Ŷ	x x	xx	W Bioomfield	8923	West Bloomfield H S	1.			X	Pipestone :	7858	Pipestone Sr H S	X	1 X	x	x I	ž
ky-	9422	Holly Area H S	X	Y	XX	Warren	7063	De La Salle Collegiate High Sch	1^	X	Ŷ	Ŷ	Prior Lake	8050	Pnor Lake Sr H S	X	n.	Ĩ.	x	X
wei	8488	Howel H S	Ŷ	1	x r		2054	Macomb Comm Coll	X	X	(X)	Ş	Randolph Red Lake Falls	6801	Randolph H S	1.1	x		x	ľ
lay City	7910	Imiay City H S	11		1 X		6371	Warren Woods Tower H S	11		x	x	Red Wing	7869	Central H S	X	1		S	
STAF	7716	Inkster H S	X		X	Washington	7781	Eisenhower H S	X	x	, X	x I	Redwood Falls Richfield	7870	Rechired Sr H S	Â		x	1	
eriochen va	6389 7717	Interlochen Arts Academy Iona H S	x	× ,	x	Thate loro	9312	Waterford Kattering H S	10	21	X	X	Rochester	7872	John Marshall H S	X	X	X	X.	2
n Rwer	7794	West Iron County H S	X		X.	Waterviet	9018	Waterford Moti H S Waterviet H S	×	×	1×	1		2142	Rochester Comm Coll	1	Ŷ	Ŷ	Ŷ	5
ckson	8138	East Jackson HS	x	^ '	x x	Webberville	5649	Webbervile H S	X		X	X	Rockford	8410	Rockford H S	x	11	1	XI.	2
2	9035	Jackson H S	X	XX	XXX	West branch	7615	John Glenn H S	â		x	1	Rosemount	9462	Rosemount H S	x	X		X	
and the second	9387	Northwest H S			XX	Wyoming	9039	Wyoming Park H S	X	X	X	X	Rushford Saint Charles	6275	Rushlord Peterson H S Saint Charles H S			1	1	5
amesburg	6377 7682	Johannesburg Lewiston H S Kelamazoo Christian H S	X		X x	MICHIGAN Non	Saturd	ry Test Centers*	11		1	11	Saint Cloud	9640	Apolio H S	X	X	¥1	š	2
1	2066	Western Michigan Univ	X	XX	XXX	Battle Creek	7762	Battle Craek Academy	24	12	10	12	Saint Francis	8828	St Francis H S	x	$ ^{ }$	1	1	5
gstord te Odessa	7795	Lakewood H S	X	*	XX	Bernen Springs	1992	Andrews Univ Great Lakes Adventist Acad	24		10	12	Saint Louis Pk	7879	Benade St Margarets H S	X	1.	1		3
gnen	7825	Eastern HS	X	X	XX	Detroit	9488	Unw of Detroit Mercy	24		10	12	Saint Paul	2088	Bethel Coll	x	Ŷ		x	5
1.131	8760 9375	JW Senton HS	X		1 x x	Oak Park	7813	S A Alexander Beth Jacob Sorino Vale Academy	24		10			6395	Concordia Academy	X	1	1	X	
peer .	7295	Lapeer East HS	X	,	XXX	MINNESC	ATO	and a state of the		-		-	1.1	7881	Crebn Derham Hal	x	x	1	SI	í
con Park	8523	Lincon Park HS	^		1013	Abany	6212	Albeny Sr H S	11	11	1x	X	19.30	2114	Harding Sr HS	x	ix	÷.	÷1	,
ona	2022	Madorina Univ	x	X	XX	Albert Las	7827	ADMILAS STHS	X		X	X	11 125	7882	HII Murray H S	1	X	X		3
1.00	9102	Winston Churchill H S .	X		XX	Anota	8885	Anoka H S	11	1	X		1. 1.	2138 6122	St Paul Acad & Summit School	1	1	1	x	ľ
notion	9178 6713	Lowel Sr H S	X	* *	1XXX	Alwater	6214	Anwater Grove City Sr H 8		x	X		Saint Peter	2112	Gustavus Adolphus Col	1.	1.1	-	x	1
dmoone	9275	Lutheran H S North	12	XX	X	Austin *	2082	Austin Comm Coll	X	X	XX	X	Shakopee	6357	Snakopes Sr H S	â	Â	1		ŝ
inson Heights	7798	Manutize H S	×	^ ^	1 X X	Baudette	8873	Lake of the Woods H S c Bernidii St Univ	x	x	XX	x	Sherburn	6218	Martin County West H S	1.		11	X	
NUDDER	7302	Manistoue H S			XX	Biare .	6478	Biaine H S	10		510	12	South State Paul	7887	South St Paul H S	â		11	Ŷ	Ĺ
Energy	7799	Manace H S	x		x x	Bioomington	2123	Bethany Academy Normandale Comm Coll	X	X	XXX	X	Spring Valley	8065	Kingsland H S	1,	1	x I	X	,
-	2038	Notien Michigan Univ	X	X X	XXX	1	7850	Thomas Jefferson H S .	1	X	X	1.	Virgina	2158	Mesabi Comm Coll	1x	1X	x	x	ĺ
dand	7710	Moand H S	X	Ŷ	x x	Branerd	9652 9811	Brainerd Sr H S	X	x	x x	X	Wacona	6218	Wadona HS	1x	X		ž	2
en.	7928	Mian HS	X		1×	Brooklyn	6596	Brooklyn Ctr H S	1.	X	XX	X	Warroad	7890	Warroad H S	11	11	x	X	í
	7839	St Mary Catholic Central	â	ď	Îx	Byron	6325	Byron H S	1	11	1^	x	Waterca	9587	Waseca H S Watertown Mayer H S			11	Ŷ	
Cemens	7785	Choose Viv H S East	11	X	XX	Cawdonia	7796	Caledonia H S	X		Š	X	White Bear Lake	2125	Lakewood Comm Col	X	X	š	š	2
	9011	L'Ares Creuse Sr H S	X		XX	Canby	7836	Canby H S	Ŷ		X		Windom	7900 7897	Wurder S/HS Windom Area HS	Â	1	^	Ŷ	ľ
	7802	Mount Demens H S Central Michigan Llow	Ŷ	x		Chasks	7316	Chasks H S Booort H S	X		X		Winone	2162	Winona St Unw	X	X	X	X	3
Plaasant	14/2				- 1 M I M	LOOP DOT INC		**************************************				- C. (T MONTH AND A		INCOMPANY WINEYOU PLS				1	

. . 17

· · · ·

Contin

ued on next page

City Code Te	1321 1321 1321 1321 1321 1321 1321 1321	1661 11 Ung	Code	a Test Center	Oct. 23, 1993	Dec. 11, 1993 Feb. 5, 1994	Apr. 9, 1994 Jun. 11, 1994	City	 Code	Test Center	Oct. 23, 1993	Dec. 11, 1993	Anr. 9, 1994	Jun. 11, 1994
Minnesota, cont. MINNESOTA Non-Saturday Test Hutchinson 7851 Maplewo Minneapolis 9548 Universit	Centers*	Bolivar 10 10 12 Boonville	6481 Biue 9410 Bolive 2368 South 8251 Boon	Springs South H S v R1 H S west Baptist Univ ribe R1 H S	X	X X X X X X	x x x x	-	8098 7947 2323 9845 7865	Lutherah H S North Mehlwis Sr H S Missouri Baptist Coll Oakville H S Parrway: Central Ir H S	XXX	XXX		XXXX
MISSISSIPPI Anguila 6626 Anguita Batasville 6683 North De 9858 South Pa	HS X X X ta School X X X nota HS X X X	X X Bowling Green Brookfield Cabcol Candenton Canton	9228 Bowi 7858 Brook 7976 Cabo 7745 Camo 2290 Cutve	ng Green H S field R III H S al Mxddie School enton H S r Stockton Coll	XXXX	X X X X	X X X X X X X		7739 9635 6152 7945 2297	Parxway North H S Parkway West H S Rosati Kain H S St Josephe Academy St Josephe Academy St Louis C C Florissant Viy	x x x	x		X X X
Baly State Lobits Booz Partocot Beltoni 7911 Humphre Benton 6658 Yazoo G Booneville 2225 Northeas Brandon 9525 Brandon Brankhan 9910 Semant C	ys County H S X X ys County H S X X t MS Comm Coll X X X H S X X X H S X X X	Cape Girardeau Cardwell X X Caruthersville X X Cassville Cassville Center	2366 South 8259 South 7929 Carut 7984 Cass 7713 Mark	easl Missouri St Unhr land H S hersville H S ille H S Twain H S	×·×	X. X X	x x x x		2299 7192 2352 8074 2383	St Louis C C Forest Park St Louis Priory School St Louis Univ St Louis Univ H S U of MO at St Louis	XXXX	x	x x x x	****
Bruce 9875 Bruce H Bruce 9875 Bruce H Canton 7999 Canton P Clarksdale 2186 Cozhorn Cleveland 2190 Deta Stil	S X X X ublic Sch H S Div X Jr Coll X X X Jniv X X X	Charleston Chillicothe Clayton X X Clayton X X Clinton Y Y Columbia	 9229 Charl 7927 Chillic 7829 Clayte 7751 Clinto 9230 Hicks 	eston HS othe HS In HS n Sr HS uun HS	XXXXX	x x X x	X X X X X X	Saint Peters	8826 2385 2385 6799 2281	Viunney H S Washington Univ Webster Univ Lutheran H S, St Charles Co St Charles County C C	XXXX	XXX	x x x x	XXXXX
Columbia 9457 Columbia Columbia 9457 Columbia Columbus 2222 MS Univ Connth 9865 Conth P	o Coli X X X HS X X X tor Women X X X IS X X	X X X X X X De Soto X Deering	7940 Rock 5849 Cono 9724 St Pa 9957 De Sc 9744 Detta	Bridge HS xolia Jr Sr HS a's Lutheran HS to HS C7 HS	x x x x x	××	x x x x	Salem Salisbury Sedalia Shelbina	7748 9149 7037 2356 9672	Salesbury H S Salesbury H S Smith Cotton H S State Fair Comm Coll South Shelby H S	××××	XXX		XX
Crystal Springs 9043 Crystal S D'Iberville 8840 D'Ibervill Decatur 2192 East Cen Ellisville 2205 Jones Co Enterprise 8818 Enterpris	Pringsh S X BHS X traiComm Coli X X X xrity Jr Coli X X X e HS X	X X Elington X X Elington X X Excelsior Spgs	9187 Dexte 7025 El Do 9737 Sout 9891 Highl 7188 Excel	r H S ado Springs H S em Reynolds County R II ind H S lior Springs H S	***	XXX	X X X X X X	Sikeston Springfield	7749 7945 9407 7944 6369	Siteston Sr H S Central H S Glendale H S Hildcrest H S Kickapoo H S	****	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX		XXXXX
Forest 9449 Forest H Futon 2202 Itawambu Gautier 2203 MS Gulf I Goodman 2200 Holmes C	S X X X Comm Coll X X X Coast Comm Coll X X X comm Coll X X X comm Coll X X X	X X Fair Grove X X Farmington X X Festus X X Flat River	9110 Fair 0 9414 Farmi 9884 Festu 6690 Centr 2305 Miner	rove HS Ington HS SHS AR 3HS Al Area Coll	XXXXXX	X X X X X X X X X X	X X X X X X X X	Strationd Sullivan Thayer	6382 2370 6878 6592 7915	Parknew H S Southwest MO St Univ Strafford H S Sulivan H S Thayer Sr H S	****	XXXX		X X X
Greenwood - 912 Solonon Greenwood - 9729 Greenwo Greenada - 9529 Greenada 2257 Holmes C Guttport - 9875 Harrison	od HS X X HS X X X Comm Col X X Gentral HS X X X	X X X X X X X X Forsyth X X Fredericktown .	6601 McCli 9781 McCli 6112 Forsy 9899 Frede 9238 Futtor	er HS er North HS th HS nicktown HS	X X X X X	X X X X X X	X X X X X X	Theodosia Trenton Troy Union Urbana	7032 9396 7046 22%4 5310	Lutie H S Trenton H S Buchanan H S East Central Coll Hickory County R I School	XXXX	XXX		X X
Hattiesburg 2218 Univ of S Hazieturst 6633 Hazieturst Heidelberg 9913 Heidelber Hernando 7154 Hernando	outhern MS X X X stHS X X X DHS X X X X	X X Gideon Greenville Hannibal X X Havt	6343 Gideo 6149 Green 2320 Hano 7589 Harris 7053 Havti	n HS wille R 2 HS bal La Grange Coll ormide HS	XXX	XXXX	X X X X X X	Van Buren Viburnum Warteel Warrensburg Washington	7100 6855 9679 2272 9690	Van Buren H S tron County C4 H S North Perniscot H S Central MO St Univ Washington H S	XXXXX	X	XXX	X X X
Horry Springs 2240 Hust Coll Horn Lake 9892 Horn Lak Inta Bena 2224 KS Vahe Iuka 2272 Tishomin Jackson 2180 Beineven	eHS X X StUniv X X coloumtyHS X X Col X X X	X X Hermann X X Hillsboro X House Springs X X Imperial Independence	9105 Herm 2313 Jeffer 9565 North 8785 Winds 7930 Wilka	ann Sr H S son Coll west H S or H S n Christman H S	****	X X X X X X	X X X X X	Waynesville Webster Groves West Plains Willard	9823 6113 9840 7948 9693	Waynesville H S Nennu: Hell Wentzville H S West Plains H S Watard H S	****	X X X X		XXXXX
6785 ±coulding 6787 Forest Hi 2204 Jackson 8981 Laner H 9452 Murrah H		X X Jefferson City X X X X Joplin X X Joplin X X Kanses City	7931 Helia: 8769 Jelfel 2322 Linco 2304 MO S 2278 Avila	H S son City H S n Univ outhern St Coll Coll	XXXXX	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	X X X X X X X X	MISSOURI Non-S Centrake Kansas City Saint Louis	7926 9489 9492	y Test Centers* Sunnycz'e Academy Univ of Missouri Univ of MO at St Louis	24	12 12 12	11 11 6 11	12
Laurei 9251 R H Wath Laurei 9251 R H Wath Liberty 9049 Amte Co Long Beach 9695 Long Bea Lorman 2176 Alcorn St	HS A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	X X X	7934 Cente 2331 Mapk 6322 Metro 9141 Park 2342 Rock	r Sr H S Woods Comm Coll politan H S Hill Sr H S Hurst Coll	XXXXX	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	MONTAN/ Ashland Baker Big Sandy Big Tember	7949 7950 7973 7961	St Labre Catholic School Baker H S Big Sandy H S Sweet Cro H S	0000	0		
Lucadale 7941 George C Matriston 2256 Wood Jr McComb 7919 McComb 6880 Parklane 2010 McComb	ACademy X X X	X X X X Kearney Kennett King City	7933 Ruski 2380 U of 1 7029 Kearr 9352 Kenn 8881 King i	h H S 40 Kansas City ey Sr H S mi H S hty R I School	X X X	X X X X X	X X X X	Billings Bozeman Broadus Broadus	8878 2416 9013 7952 7996	Billings West H S Eastern Montana Coll Bozeman H S Powder River H S Riackteet Boarding Dormitory	XXXXO	XXX		XXX
Merican 2210 Merican 6678 Merican Mississippi State 2220 Mesissaip Moortead 2244 MS Detta Morton 6296 Morton H	HS X X of St Univ X X Comm Coll X X X S X X X	X X Kirksville X X Lebanon X X Lebanon Lee's Summit Lexington	2335 North 2328 St Lo 9221 Labai 9780 Lee's 2390 Went	east Missouri St U Jis C C al Meramec Ion H S Summit H S Vorth Military Academy	****	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	Butte Chester Circle Colstrip	2418 9000 9001 9244 7953	MT Coll Mineral Sci & Tech Chester H S Cricte H S Colstrip H S Control H S	XOXO	X O		x
New Albany 5250 W P Dan- New Albany 5250 W P Dan- New Augusta 8810 Perry Ce- Docan Springs 9897 Ocean 5 Outer 8700 Latastra	ricoln Comm Coll X X X el H S X noal H S X X X senos H S X X X X X X	X X Liberty X Lint X Macon X X Malden X X Malden	2394 Willia 5105 Linn 7955 Maco 9345 Malde 7937 Parto	n Jewell Coll echnical Coll n County A I School n H S ray South H S	X	X X X	XXXX	Culbertson Cut Bank Dison Exalaka Ennis	9440 7954 2428 7276 9002	Culterison H S Cut Bank H S Western Montana Col Carter County H S Madison Valley H S	XOX	0	×	×
9721 Oxford H Pascagoula 9882 Pascagou Paarl 8949 Pearl H S Pertinston 2234 MS Guff Deval H S	S X X X Aa H S X X X Goast Comm Coll X X	X Mansheld Marshall X Maryland Height X Maryville X Memphia	6117 Laura 2330 Misso 5 7935 Patto 2338 North 7942 Scott	Ingalis Wilder Sich un Valley Coll wille Sr H S west MO St Univ Ind Co H S	XXXX	XXXXX	XXXX	Eureka Gardiner Glasgow Glendive Grant Falls	9006 6863 7957 2414 7959	Lincoin County H S Gardwer H S Gatsgow Sr H S Dawson Coli C M Russell H S	XXXXX	XXX	() () ()	
Philadelphia 6835 Choctaw B135 Neshoba Picayune 6115 Picayune Piney Woods 6400 Piney Wo Poney in 2020 Band Film	Central H S X X X Central H S X X X Memorial H S X X X cos Country Life Sch X X X X	X Mexico X X Moberly X X Mountain View X X Mountain View	7936 Mexic 8761 Misso 7741 Mobe 7599 Libert 7938 M: Ve	o Sr HS uniMikaany Academay ny Sr HS y HS rmon HS	XXXX	X X X	XXX	Hemilton Harlowton Harre	2410 7960 7961 8252 2424	Coll of Great Falts. Great Falts H S Haminton H S Harlowton H S Normern Montana Coll	X O X	X X X	x x x x	X
Prentas 9993 Prentas Quitman 9713 Quaman Raymond 2198 Hinds Co Ridgeland 2255 Holmes C Senatobia 2228 Northwes	HS X X HS X X mm Coll X X X C Ruopeland Cent X X t MS Comm Coll X X X	X Neosno X Nevada X X New Madrid X X North Kanses C X X O'Fallon	2289 Crow 8765 Neva 9260 New 7832 North 6442 Ft Zu	a Jr Sr H S Audrid County R 1 Kansas City H S mwatt North H S	****	x x x x x	x x x x x x	Helena Jordan Kalispeli Lewistown	2406 7962 7964 2417 7966	Carroll Coll Helena H S Garfield County H S Fisthead Valley Comm Coll Fergus H S	XXX	X X	XX	X
Sheby 8979 Brost St Southaven 8833 Southave Statikine 6496 F O Alexa Summit 2242 Southere University 2250 Univ of M	neetHS X X n HS X X X InderHS X X X st MS Comm Coll X X X InsessScori X X	X Vortand A X X Overland A X Dzark X X Perryville X X Piessant Hill	9901 Riten 6225 Ozari 7915 Peny 8892 Pleas	Alter HS 22 HS 22 Alter HS 22 Mit HS 22 Hit HS 24 Hit HS	x x y	x X	XXXX	Libby Livingston Maita Medicine Lake Metstone	7967 9014 7968 8073 9740	Libby Sr H S Park Sr H S Maha H S Medicine Lake H S Medicine Lake H S	00	XXX	×	
Utica 2223 Hinds C (Vicksburg 7921 Vicksburg Waynesboro 7518 Wayne C Weisson 2188 Copueh L Winona 6220 Winona H	Ubca Cam X X X HS X X X mooth Comm Coll X X X	X X Poplar Buff X X Poplar Buff X Princeton X X Ruytown	7939 Popla 6497 Porta 6162 Princo 9237 Rayto	BurlisrHS pevile HS mon HS wn South HS	~~~~	х х v v		Miles City Missoula Nashua Philipsburg Plans	2412 2422 6574 9635 7969	Make Comm Coll Univ of Moritana Nashua H S Granite H S Plains Public School	X	X X	Ŷ	XX
Woodville 9520 Wildinson Yazoo City 7012 Yazoo Cit MISSISSIPPI Non-Setundary Test Jackson 9520 Jackson	ICoHS X TyHS X X Centers* StUmiv 12	X Roks X Saint Charles	9842 Rola 2396 Univ 9098 Franc 7683 St Ch	HS HOW at Rolla SHOWEN North HS arter HS	****	× × × ×	ŶXXX XXXX	Pientywood Polson Poplar Roundup Rudyard	7970 7951 8773 7958 7971	Pennywood H S Poblar Public Schools Roundup H S Blue Sky H S	0 ×00	x	, ,	X
Appleton City 8747 Sant Cial Appleton City 8747 Sant Cial Article 8231 For HS	in Courny R2 HS X X X X	X X X Saint Louin	6586 St Ca 8922 Centr 2344 MO V 4908 North	IF H S IF H S Verstern St Coll Mest Missouri Comm Coll IF S	****	x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x		Scobey Shelby Sidney Supenor Westby	9015 8825 7972 9535 6198	Scobey H S Snetby H S Sconey Sr H S Supenor Jr H S Westby H S	XOX	X X	^ c	
Aurora 5381 Aurora R Baiwin 9762 Lafayette Berkaley 7924 Berkeley Bue Springs 5316 Bue Spri		X X X	7943 Bisho 2298 Fonta	p Du Bourg H S onne Coll wood Centrel H S	Ŷ	хx	×x	Wh Sulphur Spgs Wibaux Wolf Point	7974 9634 7975	White Sulphur Springs H S Wideux County H S Wolf Point H S	DO X		I,	

1

• ore

.

Image: 1 Image: 1		City	Code (Test Center	Det. 23, 1993	eb. 5, 1994	bu. 11, 1994	City	Code	Test Center	Det. 23, 1993	eb. 5, 1994	Juri. 11, 1994	City	Code	Test Center	Oct. 23, 1993	Dec. 11, 1993 Feb. 5, 1994	Apr. 9. 1994 Jun. 11. 1994
The out of the statement 1 <th1< th=""> 1 1 1</th1<>		Montana, c	ont.	Test Centers*	11	<u>т</u> і.	1	Plymouth	251B	Plymouth St Coll	I Ix	I.T.	L	NEW MEXICO I Corrales	Non-Satu 6200	urday Test-Centers* Sand:s View Academy	24		TT
ALC-DATA ALC-DATA		Bozeman	7874 M	t Ellis Academy	11	2	0	NEW JEN Attantic City Blairstown	8045 9763	Atlantic City H S Blair Academy	I IX	11	X	NEW YOR	R	Akron Central H S	j.		1 Iv
Alland Total Alland	ì	NEDRASI Answorth Albion	VA 7977 AJ 7978 AJ	nsworth H S bion H S	X	×	či –	Bridgeton Bridgewater	8046 8062	Bridgeton H S Bridgewater Raritan H S	xx	xx	X	Albany	8317 7165	Albany H S Colonie H S	Ŷ	X	x x
Binscher Für Lissing ung der Ausgeschlung in der Ausgeschlungereichtereicher Ausgeschlung in der Ausgeschlung in der Ausgeschl		Atlance Atkinson	7979 AI 8635 W	liance H S est Holt H S	X		X	Cinnaminson Cinnaminson Columbus	7956 8025	Cinnaminson H S Northern Burlington H S	XX	X	1	Aimond Amherst Amhrvilla	9562 9300	Altred Almond Central H S Sweet Home H S Amityville Memorial H S	x	x	XX
Ansame Value Description Comparison Comp		Bellevus -	7981 6/ 8094 Ex	Horos Sr H S Horos East Sr H S Herve West H S	x x	< ^		Fort Lee Frenchtown	9680 8051	Fort Lee H S Delaware Valley Regional H S	X	l, ľ	ί,	Amsteroam Angelica	9624 9927	Amsterdam H S Angelica Central School	X	×	X
Durber Fig. <		Benkeknan Blair Broken Row	7982 D. 2446 Da	andy County H S	XX	x	ş X	Hightstown - Jersey City	9460 8950	Hightstown H S Ferns H S	x x	x x	Ŷ	Angola Attica Auburn	8803 2668	Attica Central Cayuga County Comm Coll	Ŷ		x x
Column Test board field Field		Chadron Columbus	2456 Ci 2475 Ci	nadron St Coll antrai C C Platte Cam	Ŷ	λ X	ξ x	Manahawkin Manasquan Malawan	9454 8053 • 9681	Southern Regional H S Manasquan H S Matawan Begional H S	XX	×		Avon Baldwin Baliston Sea	8137 8918 8365	Avon Central Jr Sr H S Baldwin Sr H S Battero Sna H S	X		XX
Type Line Line <thline< th=""> Line Line <thl< td=""><td></td><td>Cozad Crete Fikhorn</td><td>7986 Co 2448 Do 9383 Et</td><td>ozad HS Dane Coll khom HS</td><td>XXX</td><td></td><td></td><td>Mays Landing Middletown</td><td>6731 8054</td><td>Oakcrest H S Middletown H S North</td><td>XX</td><td>x</td><td>×</td><td>Batavia Bay Shore</td><td>2751 8042</td><td>Genesee Comm Coll Bay Shore H S</td><td>Ŷ</td><td>X .</td><td>x x</td></thl<></thline<>		Cozad Crete Fikhorn	7986 Co 2448 Do 9383 Et	ozad HS Dane Coll khom HS	XXX			Mays Landing Middletown	6731 8054	Oakcrest H S Middletown H S North	XX	x	×	Batavia Bay Shore	2751 8042	Genesee Comm Coll Bay Shore H S	Ŷ	X .	x x
Hundry Participant Bit All of the second terms of	÷	Fairbury	7994 M 9106 Fa	t Michael Benedictine H S sirbury H S	x		ξ x	Monmouth Jct New Brunswick	6201 2592	South Brunswick H S : Rutoers Univ	x x	x x	x	Beacon Binghamton Bohemia	7109 2684 8673	Beacon H S Broome Comm Coll Connetouot H S	X	x	XXX
Operation State Addition State		Falls Uny Franklin Fremont	7988 Fa B012 Fr 9386 Ar	anklin H S anklin H S chbishoo Bergan H S	ΙŶ.			Pemberton Pitman	6405 8058	Pemberton Township H S Pitman H S	XX	X	•	Brasher Falls Brentwood	9722 8118	Brasher Falls H S Brentwood H S	x	x	XX
Human Vision Vision </td <td></td> <td>Grand island</td> <td>2452 Mi 7989 Gr</td> <td>idland Coll and Island Sr High</td> <td>X</td> <td>۲X (</td> <td>ŝ</td> <td>Salent Sewell</td> <td>8929 2561</td> <td>Salem H S Gloucester County Coll</td> <td>x x</td> <td>x x</td> <td>x</td> <td>Brockport Bronx</td> <td>9629 9371 9253</td> <td>Harry S Truman H S Harry S Truman H S</td> <td>Ŷ</td> <td>x</td> <td>Î</td>		Grand island	2452 Mi 7989 Gr	idland Coll and Island Sr High	X	۲X (ŝ	Salent Sewell	8929 2561	Salem H S Gloucester County Coll	x x	x x	x	Brockport Bronx	9629 9371 9253	Harry S Truman H S Harry S Truman H S	Ŷ	x	Î
Holderge Point Homeling End B X<		Hastings	2456 Ha	estings Coll astings Coll astings Sr H S	Ŷ		έlχ.	Sparta Springfield	8066 8067	Sparta H S Jonathan Dayton Reg H S	XX	XX		Brookhaven Brookiyn	7260 9627	Beliport H S Abraham Lincoln H S			X
Amount Location Amount State Amount State State State <t< td=""><td></td><td>Holdrege Imperial</td><td>7991 Ho 7998 D</td><td>Norege Sr H S hase County H S</td><td>X</td><td></td><td>(x</td><td>Wayne West Caldwell</td><td>2584 8072</td><td>Wim Paterson Coll of N J James Calowell H S</td><td>Îx Î</td><td>XX</td><td>Ŷ</td><td></td><td>9931 6740 6737</td><td>Edward R Murrow H S George Wingate H S</td><td>. 🖍</td><td>x</td><td>XX</td></t<>		Holdrege Imperial	7991 Ho 7998 D	Norege Sr H S hase County H S	X		(x	Wayne West Caldwell	2584 8072	Wim Paterson Coll of N J James Calowell H S	Îx Î	XX	Ŷ		9931 6740 6737	Edward R Murrow H S George Wingate H S	. 🖍	x	XX
Strice Line of H South 15 Sum X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X		Kimbali Lincoln	7993 Ka	mball H S ncoin East H S	Ŷ	i î	ŝĮ,	Wildwood NEW JERSEY N	6131 on-Satu	Wildwood H S Inday Test Centers*	X	X			6132 5606	James Madison H S John Dawey H S		x	J, X
Size Dirac Size Size X x x x x x X x x x x x X x x x x x X x x x x x X x x x x x X x x x x x X x x x X x x x <td></td> <td></td> <td>9706 Lin 9988 Lin 2474 No</td> <td>ncoln H S South ncoln Northeast H S Scheke Weslevan Univ</td> <td>X</td> <td></td> <td>č X</td> <td>NEW ME)</td> <td>8069 (ICO</td> <td>Garden St Academy</td> <td>12</td> <td>6 11</td> <td>0 12</td> <td>Cambridge</td> <td>2690 8480</td> <td>Canisius Coll Cambridge H S</td> <td>Ŷ</td> <td>î</td> <td>χ x</td>			9706 Lin 9988 Lin 2474 No	ncoln H S South ncoln Northeast H S Scheke Weslevan Univ	X		č X	NEW ME)	8069 (ICO	Garden St Academy	12	6 11	0 12	Cambridge	2690 8480	Canisius Coll Cambridge H S	Ŷ	î	χ x
Auden OPP Auden 15 Size X <thx< th=""> <thx< th=""> X</thx<></thx<>		McCook 1	2482 Ur 2460 Ma	Cook Comm Coll	X		X	Alamogordo Albuquerque	8976 8055	Alamogordo H S Albuquerque Academy	XX	XX	X	Camden Canajoharie	9929 9930 8113	Canajohane Central H S Canajohane Central H S	X	x	L X
Non-Thates 241 Money Score 251 Cyneel 1.5 251 <td></td> <td>Mulien Murdock</td> <td>7995 Mu 6771 Ek 2476 No</td> <td>ulien HS mwood Murdock HS wrbezst Comm Coll</td> <td>X</td> <td></td> <td>X</td> <td></td> <td>8/59 9062 8077</td> <td>Albuquerque H S Cibola H S Del Norte H S</td> <td>XX</td> <td>X ×</td> <td>X</td> <td>Candor Canton</td> <td>9967 8133</td> <td>Candor Central School Hugh C Williams Sr H S</td> <td>x</td> <td>x</td> <td>X X</td>		Mulien Murdock	7995 Mu 6771 Ek 2476 No	ulien HS mwood Murdock HS wrbezst Comm Coll	X		X		8/59 9062 8077	Albuquerque H S Cibola H S Del Norte H S	XX	X ×	X	Candor Canton	9967 8133	Candor Central School Hugh C Williams Sr H S	x	x	X X
Disks Disks Disks Disks Disks X X <		North Platte	2491 M	d Pleins Comm Coll arth Platte H S	XX	X			8076 8798	Highland HS La Curiva HS	XX	XX	J	Carrhel Carthage Central Islin	9270 9641 9130	Cannel H S Cannage Central H S Central Islin H S	XXX	X	XXX
Bits3 Cartial NS X X Constraint S X X X Constraint S X <thx< th=""> <thx< th=""> <thx< th=""></thx<></thx<></thx<>		O'Neil Ogalala Omaha	8003 0 7999 00 8000 64	Neili H S paliala H S Inson H S	X	Ŷ	X		8049 8078 9241	Rio Grande H S Saint Pius X H S	x x	x x		Central Valley Champlain	9417 9370	Monroe Woodbury H S N E Clinton Central H S	XX		. X
9444 Construct Tup 7 200 Cuby 1/S Madd 200			8633 Ce 2440 Co	ntral H S Il of Saint Mary	X	(x	x		8079 6822	Sandia H S Sandia Preparatory School	X X	XX		Chatham Cheektowaga Chmenanoo	99332 9361 9980	Chatham H S Maryvale Sr H S Chittenanco Sr H S	Ŷ	x	xŶ
• • • • • • • • • • • • •			2444 Cr 8890 Da	eighton Univ	Î X	(X	X		8080 8075	Valley H S West Mesa H S	x x	1 Î	L Î	Cicero Ciarence	< 8140 9695	Cicero N Syracuse H S Clarence Cent Sr H S	XX	x	XX
2644 Union of Monoratinal Control & X X			9232 Ha 8982 Mi	ury A Burke H S liard North Sr H S	X	X	X	Animas Anthony	8944 9661	Animas H S Gadsden H S	x x	X X	x	Clifton Springs Clifton	9909 9925 9934	Midlakes H S Ckinton Sr H S	Îx		Î, X
Ord 80x Dr H S V X X <thx< th=""> <thx< th=""> <thx< th=""> <th< td=""><td></td><td>· · · ·</td><td>2454 Un 8001 We</td><td>iv of Nebraska at Omaha estside H S</td><td>x i</td><td>X</td><td>ξĺχ.</td><td>Aztec Bernatilo</td><td>9545 8083</td><td>Aznec H S Bernalillo H S</td><td>XXX</td><td>XX</td><td></td><td>Cobleskill College Point</td><td>9935 8789</td><td>Cobleskill Central School St Agnes Academic School</td><td></td><td>•</td><td>, X</td></th<></thx<></thx<></thx<>		· · · ·	2454 Un 8001 We	iv of Nebraska at Omaha estside H S	x i	X	ξĺχ.	Aztec Bernatilo	9545 8083	Aznec H S Bernalillo H S	XXX	XX		Cobleskill College Point	9935 8789	Cobleskill Central School St Agnes Academic School		•	, X
Scottbolf 242 Western Nebraska C C X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X		Ord Papelion Peni	8004 Or 8788 Pa 2470 Pa	d HS pillion La Vista HS n: St Colè	X	X,	X	Capitan Carisbad	9389 2632 8084	Capitan H S New Mexico St Univ at Carisbad Carrizozo H S	x x	XX	x	Cooperstown Copiague	9937 9954	Cooperstown H S Coplague H S	X		ÎX
Subary or Valuation Conversion Bits Definition Conversion Definition Conversion Conversion <thconversion< th=""> Conversion <t< td=""><td></td><td>Scottsbluff Seward</td><td>2478 Wi 2442 Co</td><td>estern Nebraska C C Incordia Teachers Coll</td><td>X</td><td>X</td><td></td><td>Clayton - Cloudcroft</td><td>8086 6194</td><td>Clayton H S Cloudcroft Middle School</td><td>X</td><td>X g</td><td></td><td>Corning Cornwalt Holsn Cornland</td><td>9121 8119 8120</td><td>Last H S New York Military Academy Contand Jr Sr H S</td><td>Ŷ</td><td>x</td><td>X x</td></t<></thconversion<>		Scottsbluff Seward	2478 Wi 2442 Co	estern Nebraska C C Incordia Teachers Coll	X	X		Clayton - Cloudcroft	8086 6194	Clayton H S Cloudcroft Middle School	X	X g		Corning Cornwalt Holsn Cornland	9121 8119 8120	Last H S New York Military Academy Contand Jr Sr H S	Ŷ	x	X x
Wayne 2472 Wayne 2472 Wayne 2474 Wayne 2474 Wayne 2474 Wayne 244 Wayne 245 Wayne 245 Wayne 244 Wayne 247	Ì	Supenor Supenor Valentine	7985 Su 8009 Va	perior H S lentine H S	X	×	۱^	Corona Crownpoint	8916 9919	Corona H S Crownpoint Sr H S	Î x	Ŷĝ	1	Dansville Deimar	9978 9947	Dansville Sr H S Bethlenem Cantral H S	X	J.	l İ.
NEBRASKA Hon-Saturdar Test Centrer* Image: Clamber of the Second Se	1	Wayne Wisher York	2472 Wa 5790 Wi	ayne St Coll sner Pilger H S dr Coll	X	X		Deming Dukte	8090 8091 8092	Deming HS Duice HS Esnabola Valley HS	ộ ộ	× ç		Dobbs Ferry Dryden	8943 2963	The Masters School Tompkins Contand C C		Î.	X x
Optimula Static Central HS Zait Comparing the static structure Carlow HS Carlow HS <td>1</td> <td>NEBRASKA Nor</td> <td>-Seturday</td> <td>Test Centers*</td> <td>24 1</td> <td></td> <td>0 12</td> <td>Estancia Farmington</td> <td>8093 2637</td> <td>Estancia H S San Juan Coll</td> <td>X X X</td> <td>XX</td> <td>x</td> <td>Dunkirk East Amherst</td> <td>9749 8158 8344</td> <td>Dunkirk H S Williamsvie E H S (E Amherst) East Aurora H S</td> <td>X</td> <td>X</td> <td>XXX</td>	1	NEBRASKA Nor	-Seturday	Test Centers*	24 1		0 12	Estancia Farmington	8093 2637	Estancia H S San Juan Coll	X X X	XX	x	Dunkirk East Amherst	9749 8158 8344	Dunkirk H S Williamsvie E H S (E Amherst) East Aurora H S	X	X	XXX
NEVADA Store Store <t< td=""><td></td><td>Omaha Shelton</td><td>9487 Ce 8006 Pia</td><td>ntral H S atte Valley Academy</td><td>24 24</td><td></td><td>0</td><td>Grants</td><td>2655 8096</td><td>Gastop H S Univ of NM at Gallup Grants H S</td><td>Îx Î</td><td>Î, Â</td><td>Ŷ</td><td>East Hampton East Iskp</td><td>9150 9131</td><td>East Hampton H S East Ishp H S</td><td>X</td><td></td><td>X</td></t<>		Omaha Shelton	9487 Ce 8006 Pia	ntral H S atte Valley Academy	24 24		0	Grants	2655 8096	Gastop H S Univ of NM at Gallup Grants H S	Îx Î	Î, Â	Ŷ	East Hampton East Iskp	9150 9131	East Hampton H S East Ishp H S	X		X
Austin 9277 Austin MS CO Q Control Contro Contro Contro			9622 Pa	hranagat Valley H S	1010	01.10		Hatch Hoobs	6109 2643	Hatch Valley H S New Mexico Jr Coll	x x	xx	x	East Northport East Syracuse Elienville	8127 8123 6734	E Syracuse Minoa H S Ellenville H S	Ŷ	^ .	ÎŶ (
Carson Cry 8015 Extr 1 1/2/23 Mayned HS 1 1/2/23 Mayned HS 1 1 1/2/23 Mayned HS 1 1 1/2 1 1/2 <t< td=""><td>į</td><td>Austin Battle Mountain Carlin</td><td>9297 Au 8023 Ba</td><td>stin HS the Mountain HS rin Combined Schools</td><td>X C</td><td>° {</td><td></td><td>Kintiand Las Cruces</td><td>6409 9161</td><td>Kimand Central H S Las Cruces H S</td><td>0 0 X X</td><td>C C X X</td><td>x</td><td>Eima Eimita</td><td>9745 8125 8423</td><td>iroquois Central H S Notre Dame H S</td><td>XXX</td><td></td><td>XX</td></t<>	į	Austin Battle Mountain Carlin	9297 Au 8023 Ba	stin HS the Mountain HS rin Combined Schools	X C	° {		Kintiand Las Cruces	6409 9161	Kimand Central H S Las Cruces H S	0 0 X X	C C X X	x	Eima Eimita	9745 8125 8423	iroquois Central H S Notre Dame H S	XXX		XX
by Evrstal. B010 Minine Free H S CO D D D D Consisting Status B010 Londsburg Long Londsburg Long <thlong< th=""> Londsburg Long Londsburg L</thlong<>	1	Carson City Elko	8015 Ca 8019 Elle	rson HS Ko HS	X	X	x	Las Vecas	2638 2640	Naviako H S New Mexico St Univ New Mexico Hichlands Univ	x x	x x	X	Endicott Fairport	8168 8057	Union Endicott H S Fairport H S	X	XX	x
Finning BODE Ferrioring BODE Ferrioring <t< td=""><td>1</td><td>Evreka Evreka Falion</td><td>8018 W1 8016 Eu 8020 Ch</td><td>ne Hine H S reka H S urchill County H S</td><td>0 C</td><td>x</td><td>'</td><td>Lordsburg Los Alamos</td><td>8101 8102</td><td>Lordsburg H S Los Alamos H S</td><td>XX</td><td>x x</td><td></td><td>Farmingdale Fort Covington Franklin Scutter</td><td>6188 6538</td><td>Farmingdale Sr H S Salmon River Central School Valley Stream North H S</td><td>Ŷ</td><td>x</td><td> Ŷ</td></t<>	1	Evreka Evreka Falion	8018 W1 8016 Eu 8020 Ch	ne Hine H S reka H S urchill County H S	0 C	x	'	Lordsburg Los Alamos	8101 8102	Lordsburg H S Los Alamos H S	XX	x x		Farmingdale Fort Covington Franklin Scutter	6188 6538	Farmingdale Sr H S Salmon River Central School Valley Stream North H S	Ŷ	x	Ŷ
Automotion Bits Visit Sector	į	Femiley Gabos	8008 Fe 8005 Ga	miey H S bbs H S	0	0	2	Magdalena	6845 6820	Alamo Navajo Comm School	ÎŶ Î	×		Fredonia Futton	8273 8984	Fredonia H S G Ray Bodley H S	XX		X
Las Vegas 2633 Bounta H S X	i	Henderson	6022 Bu 9211 Gr	sic HS een Valley HS	x	x	(x	Monarty Mosquero	9765 9614 8088	Monarty H S Mosquero H S	× ŏ	× Q	Ň	Gouvernour Grand Island	9328 8166	Gouverneur HS Grand Island HS	Ŷ		. X
McDarmett 7987 McDarmett 7785 Duamach 5 0 0 0 Duamach 5 X	1	Les Veges	9295 Ch 2496 10	nanza HS apartal HS iv of Nevada Las Venas	X	X	X	Pine Hill Portales	8109 2636	Pine Hill H S Eastern New Mexico Univ	ο x x	XX	x	Granville Greenport Greenport	9308 6445	Granville H S Greenport School Granvirth Cantral H S	×		X x
Mindoin 573 Dougle H/S Mindoin 573 Dougle H/S Mindoin 573 Dougle H/S Mindoin 573 Mindoin	ł	McDermitt	7987 Mc 8027 Vir	Dermit Combined Schools gin Valley H S	N N			Ramah Ramah	9735 7399 8106	Ramah H S Raton H S	X X	xx		Guilderland Ctr Hamburg	8044 9742	Guilderland H S Fromber Cent H S	XX		XX
Paracas Paracas <t< td=""><td>į</td><td>Ninden Overton Owyhee</td><td>8021 Mc</td><td>vapa Valley HS</td><td>lo d</td><td></td><td>3</td><td>Reserve</td><td>7021 2644</td><td>Heserve H S New Mexico Military Institute</td><td>x x</td><td>xx</td><td>x</td><td>Hammondsport</td><td>9092 8936 9917</td><td>Hamburg Centrel H S Hammondsport H S Hancock Central School</td><td>Ŷ</td><td>^</td><td>ΙÂ.</td></t<>	į	Ninden Overton Owyhee	8021 Mc	vapa Valley HS	lo d		3	Reserve	7021 2644	Heserve H S New Mexico Military Institute	x x	xx	x	Hammondsport	9092 8936 9917	Hamburg Centrel H S Hammondsport H S Hancock Central School	Ŷ	^	ΙÂ.
Tomograph South Biological State A <th< td=""><td></td><td>Petvump Panace Reno</td><td>8022 Pa 8029 Lm</td><td>hrump Valley H S com Courty H S d Woostar & S</td><td>x ľ</td><td></td><td></td><td>Rudoso Santa Fe</td><td>8108 9739</td><td>Ruidoso H S Sant Michael's H S</td><td>×</td><td>X</td><td></td><td>Hauppauge Hempstead</td><td>8434 7057</td><td>Hauppauge HS Hempstead HS</td><td>Ť</td><td>×</td><td>I Ľ</td></th<>		Petvump Panace Reno	8022 Pa 8029 Lm	hrump Valley H S com Courty H S d Woostar & S	x ľ			Rudoso Santa Fe	8108 9739	Ruidoso H S Sant Michael's H S	×	X		Hauppauge Hempstead	8434 7057	Hauppauge HS Hempstead HS	Ť	×	I Ľ
Smirnt seen Smirn Valley HS . U U Sinvir Cary 2545 Western New Manaco Law X X X X X Houthon Central HS X X X X Socord Hitso Central HS X X X X Socord HS Central HS X X X Socord HS Central HS X X X Socord HS Central HS X X X Socord HS Central HS X X X X X X X X X Houtson Falls B32 Hudson Falls HS X X X X X X X X X X X Houtson Falls B4 S X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	į	Round Mountain	6266 Pro 6452 Ro	octer R Hug H S und Mountain Jr Sr H S	x		X	Santa Rosa Shiprock	7036 8110 6337	Senta Fe H S Senta Rose H S Shiorock H S	XXX	XX	X	Hicksville Highland Falls	9106 6291	Hicksville Sr H S James I O'Neill H S	x	Ŷ	× x̂
Week B035 Weik H S 0		Sparks Tonopah	9689 Sm 8048 Ed 8032 To	non Valley H.S. ward Reed H.S. nopah H.S.	X	x	<u>s</u> x	Silver City Socorro	2646 2642	Western New Mexico Univ NM Inst of Mining & Tech	× X	XXX	×	Hiton Houghton Hudson Falls	9203 2756 8024	Hitton Central H S Houghton Coll Hudson Faits H S	x	×	X
Therefore a subject of the subject o	1	Well's Winnemucca	8035 We 8034 Att	HIS H S HIS H S	No.	N X		Thoreau Tierra Amanita	7732 8111	Thoreau H S Escalame H S	Î.			Huntington Sta	8876 8435	Huntington H S Watt Wintman H S	X	X	
NEW HAMPSHIRE Trum Or Cons B113 Hot Sories XX X Jamestown 2774 Jamestown Com Col X X Jamestown Com Col X X Jamestown Com Col X X Jamestown Com Col X X Jamestown Com Col X X Jamestown Com Col X X Jamestown Com Col X X Jamestown Com Col X X Jamestown Com Col X X Jamestown Com Col X X Jamestown Com Col X X Jamestown Com Col X X Jamestown Com Col X X Jamestown Com Col X X X Jamestown Com Col X X X Jamestown Com Col X X X X Jamestown Com Col X X X X Jamestown Com Col X X X X Jamestown Com Col X X X X Jamestown Com Col X X X X Jamestown Com Col X X X X Jamestown Com Col X X X X Jamestown Com Col X X X X Jamestown Com Col X X X X Jamestown Com Col X X X X Jamestown Com Col X X X X Jamestown Com Col X X X X X Jamestown Com Col X X X X X Jamestown Com Col X X X X X Jamestown Com Col X X X X X Jamestown Com Col X X X X X X Jamestown Com Col X X X X X Jamestown Com Col X X X X X Jamestown Com Col X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	_ i	NEW HAN	IPSHIF	RE .	1010		<u></u>	Tohatchi Truth Or Cons Tucutocari	8107 8113	Tohatchi H.S. Hot Springs H.S. Tucikoran H.S.	X.	XX		Jamestown Jasper	2774 9802	Jamestown Comm Coll Jasper Troopsburg Cent Sch	Ŷ	2	Ŷ Ŷ

ACT Test Centers •Non-Saturday test centers are listed at the end of each state. See page 11 for eligibility. X = Test Center is open for that test date. O = See your counselor for the test date.

	City	Code	Test Center	11 23, 1993	ec. 11, 1993 p	pr. 9, 1994	un. 11, 1994	City	Code	eTest Cantor 🛄 .	Xtl. 23, 1993	Dec. 11, 1993	eb. 5, 1994 Apr. 9, 1994	Jun. 11, 1994	City	Code	Test Center	Oct. 23, 1993	Dec. 11, 1993	ADL 9, 1994	Jun. 11, 1994
	New York, o	Sont.	Keemone W Sr H S		<u>x I</u>	<u> ∢</u>	- X I	NEW YORK Non-	Satur 8605	day Tast Centers* Normeastern Academy	24			12	Watford City Westhope	8354 9696	Watford City H S Westhope Public School	X	x	×I.	X
	Kings Park Kingston	9133 9068 8128	Kings Park H S Kingston H S	XX	×	x	X	Union Springs	2992 8149 8816	Yeshiva Univ Union Springs Academy Greater New York Academy	24	12	10	12	Williston Wishek NORTH DAKOTA	3219 8333 Non-S	Wishok Sr H S aturday Test Centers*	Ŷ	î	Î	
	Lik Ronkonkoma Lancaster	9139 9961	Sachem H S South Campus Lancaster H S	Ŷ	×	x	XX	NORTH C	ARC	LINA	1.1		<u>بن</u> ر ر	<u> </u>	Brsmatck	8178	Dakota Adventist Academy	Ц	12	6	\perp
	Liberty Lindenhurst Livernool	8186 8144 9945	Liberty Central H S Lindenhurst Sr H S	X	x	X	x /	Arden Asheville	9859 6301 6493	A C Reynolds H S T C Roberson H S	x	x	x		Ada	3310	Ohio Northern Univ Ellet H S	X	X		X.
	Lockcort Long Beach	9505 8036	Locuport H S Long Beach H S	XX	X		XX	Banner Elk Black Mountain	3116 9871	Lees McRaa Coll C D Owen H S Constant of Contex	X		·	Ļ		7932 9909	Firestone H S Manchester H S Summit Co	X	x	X	x
	Lyons Malone	8150 9979 8130	Lownie Acad & Cent Sch Lyons Jr Sr H S Franklin Academy	Ϋ́			XXX	Chapel Hill Chapel Hill Charlotte	8868 9579	Chapel Hill H S E Mecklenburg H S			x	Î	Alliance Ashland	3298 3298 8188	Mount Union Coll Ashland H S	XX	xx	ŶX	Ŷ
	Manhasset Marcy	9435 9736 8157	St Mary's H S Whitesboro H S Marriego Control H S	¥.		XXX		1.2	8359 7042 9580	Independence H S Northside Christian Acad Otympic Sr H S	×	x x	X		Ashtabula Athens	3773 3314	Kent St Univ, Ashtabula Campus Ohio Univ Aurora H S	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
	Mastic Beach · Mattruck	9292 9134	Wilkam Floyd H S Mattruck Cutchogue H S	Ŷ	×	Ŷ	X	Dallas Durnam	3165 6316	Gaston Coll Southern H S	X	X	XXX	X	Barberton Barnesville	9637 6453	Barberton H S Barnesville H S	Ŷ	<u> </u>		Ŷ
	Medica Medica Mode island	9135 8228 8131	Patchogue Mediord H S Medina H S Londwood H S	XXX	x	x	X	Ekzabethtown Ekzabethtown Eayetteville	5095 5861 6902	East Bladen H S E E Smith Sr H S	x	X	xx	Î	Bay Village Beavercreek Bedford	8193 7143 8194	Bayers Beavercreek HS Bedford HS	Ŷ	Ŷ		Ŷ.
	Middletown Miller Place	2848 9126 8132	Drange County Comm Coli Miller Place H S Montemilio H S	X	X	X	X F	orest City	6292 6725 9277	Terry Santord H S East Rutherford H S Northwest Sr H S	X	X	XXX	X	Bellefontaine Bellevue	8195 8195 8196	Bellefontaine Sr H S Bellevue Sr H S Beres H S	X	XX	×	x
	Morava Mount Vernon	9330 6779	Moravia H S Mount Vernon H S	<u>^</u>	x		χ.	arean vide	9912 3094	Water Hines Page H S East Carolina Univ	X	X	x	X	Bowling Green	9430 3240	Bowling Green H S Bowling Green St Univ	x	x		X
	Nanuet New Hardord New Rochelle	9415 9948 2770	Nanuel Sr H S New Hanford Sr H S Jona Coli	XXX	X	X	X	tavelock tayesville lamestown	9222 8487 9585	Hayeson H S Hayeson H S Ragadale H S	Ŷ		x	X	Broadview Hts Bronswick Broan	8197 8543 8198	Brecksville Broadview Hts H S Brunswick H S Bryan H S	XX	x		XX
	Newark Valley Niagara Fats	9694 9977	Newark Valley H S Niagara Falis H S	XX		I, I	X	Cannapolis Cinston	6793 7917 5741	A L Brown H S Bethel Academy Lossburg H S	1.	X	x	Y	Bucyrus Burton	8199 3224	Bucyrus H S Kent St Univ, Geauga Campus	X	X	Š Į ž	X
•	North Creek N Massapequa	9944 9401	Johnsburg Central School Planedge H S	Ŷ		Î	X	viarion Marshville	6208 6293	Mc Dowell H S Forest Hills H S	X	X	x		Cambridge Canal Fulton	8200 8553	Cambridge H S Northwest H S	X	χ.		X
۰.	N Tonswanda Northport Norwich	9563 9307 9949	North Tonawanda Sr H S Northport H S Nonwich H S	XXX		ľ	x	Nebane Norganton At Gilead	6246 6178 6656	Lastern Alamance H S Tabernacle Christian School West Montgomery H S	· ^		x		Canton . Celina	3226 3289 8202	Kent St U Stark Campus Malone Coll Celina Jr H S	XX	X		X
	Nyack Ogdensburg	6127 8933	Nyack H S Opdensburg Free Academy	X		x	X	vit Pieasant Vewton	9336 6240 6256	Mount Pleasant H S Newton Conover H S J F Webb H S	X		x		Centerville Chardon	9150 9525 8203	Centervice H S Chardon H S Wort Gazura H S	×			XX.
	Oneida Oneonta	8421 8134	Onexida H S Oneonta Sr H S	XX			X	linetops Raetord	6757 6425	Southwest Edgecombe H S Hoke County H S		XX			Chillicothe	7273 3313	Chilicothe H S Onio U Chilicothe Cempus	X	X	XX	x
	Oswego Pawing	9951 9362	Oswego H S Trinty Pawling School	Ŷ	x		λ,	lobersonvilie	6146 9219	Wake Christen Academy Roanoke H S	ļ.	Î	Î	Ŷ	Cincinnati	8205 9918	Anderson H S Colerain Sr H S Madeira H S	Î	Ŷ	χĮ,	Ŷ
	Penn Yan Perry Perry	9094 9365	Penn Yan Academy Peny Central School Pentford Suthedard H S	XX	¢ i	X	XF	Rockingham Socky Mount	8968 3135 8147	Richmond Sr H S NC Wesleyan Coll Butberfordton Spindale H S		x	XXX			8755 6319 9789	Oak Hills H S Purceil Marian H S Booer Baccos H S	X	×	XXX	X X
:	Platisourch Portville	2944 9952	St Univ at Plattsburgh Portville Central School	Ŷ	ŝ	Ŷ	X	aniord	9982 9509	E Rowan Sr H S Lee County Sr H S	X	x	X			3340 8899	Univ of Cincinnati Walnut Hills H S	X	×	X	X
	Pulaski Oueensbury	8145 8099	Potscam H S Potaski Sr H S Queensbury H S	Ŷ.		$ ^{} $	XXX	outhport aylorsville	6579 6602	Brunswick Comm Col Alexander Central H S	Ŷ		x		Circleville Clayton	8217 9285	Circleville H S Montgomery County Jvs	Ş	x	x x	Ŷ
	Ravena Red Hook Biomond Hi On	9287 9250 9968	Rev Coeymans Seikirk Sr H S Red Hook H S Roomond Hill H S			X	X	Innity Valnut Cove Vashington	9508 6324 6309	Trinity H S South Stokes H S Washington H S	X	x	x		Cleveland	7725 8192 9256	Northmont Sr H S Benedictine H S Cleveland Cent Catholic H S	X	X	XX	XXX
	Riverhead Rochester	8143 8422	Averhead H S Aquinas Institute	X		X	x	Voiteville Vilmington	6485 6268	Whitewile H S E A Laney H S When T Horocard H S	x	X	X		1.1	8211 3263	Colinwood H S Cuyshoga C C Metro Campus		XX	x	x
		8151 9087	Gales Chill Central School Greece Arcadia H S	Ŷ	ŝ.	Ŷ	XV	Vilson	7653 9159	Wikmington Christian Acad Wilson Christian Academy			XX			8212 6759	John Adams H S Saint Ignatius H S	X	Ŷ.	×ÌX	X.
	Rocky Point	9669 9136 8033	Irondequori H S Racky Point Jr Sr H S Rome Free Academy	XX		x	Ĩ,	WINSION SAME	A Not	-Saturday Test Centers*			^ (^		Cieveland Hts Columbus	8216 6107 8219	Dishop Hartley H S Bishop Watterson H S	X			x x
	Selamanca Sanborn - Sanborn -	9955 9363 2864	Salamanca H S Nagara Wheatfield Sr H S	X			Ϋ́,		8165	Fletcher Academy		12	10	íL		3242 9638	Capital Univ Centennial H S Columbus St C C	X	X	XX	X
	Saratoga Spos Sayvilie	9632 8426	Saranoga Springs H S Sarwine H S	X			Я I E	Seach Selcourt	8792 3191	Beach H S Turbe Mountain C C	X	x	X x			6418 3275	Fort Hayes Metro Ed Center Franklin Univ	X	Ŷ.	Ì	x
•	Schenectady Selden Setauket	8145 9140 9146	Schenectady H S Newfield H S Ward Metville H S	XXX		x x	χ.	ieulati Ismarck	8171 6773 3196	Beulah H S Bismarck H S Bismarck St Coll	XXX	XXX	X X X X	XXX	• • • • • •	6167 6306 6434	Hamilton Townsmp H S Independence H S Mittlin H S	1X	Ŷ	Î	Ŷ
	Shrub Qak - Sidney Smithmen	8104 9924 9137	Lakeland HS Sidney HS Smatheman HS	x			Ž.	ottineau	3201 3204	Univ of Mary NDSU Bottmeau	X	X	x	x		3312 9990 8983	Ohio St Univ St Charles Preparatory School - The Welliomon School	X	XXX	XXX	X
	Solvay Spencerport	9404 8159	Solvary H S E J Wilson H S	X.		ž	X	kowman Gevaler	8172 9445	Bowman H S Cavalier Public School	Ŷ	XX			Conneaut	8220 6330	Upper Arlington H S Conneaut H S	X	×	×	×.
	Stamford . Staten bland	9958 6363	Stamiord Central School Staten Island Academy	x		$\left \right $	Ŷ	Josby Devids Lake Dickinson	8173 3198 3210	Divide County H S UND Lake Region Dickinson St Univ	XXX	X	XX	X	Cosnoctori Cuyahoga Fails	8222 9175	Coshocton H S Walsh Jesuit H S	X	X	XX	x
	Syosset Syracuse	8879 9959 8085	Staten Island Tech H S Syosset H S Bishoo Ludden H S	x		ľ	χ.	ageley Igin	8174 6755	Edgeley H S Elgin Public H S North Dakata St Linix	X		XXX		Cuyahoga Fis Dayton	8223 8225 5821	Cuyahoga Falis H 5 Chaminade Julienne H S Davton Career Academy	X	ŝ	x	X
		8043 9734 2847	Concorain H S Henninger H S Departage Commt Coll	X			Χľ,	oman	6444 6850	North H S Sargent Central School	Ŷ		x	X	Daliance	6782 3295 3264	Oakwood H S Wright St Univ Defiation Coll	X	x	XX	XX
	Татурия	9974 7378	West Genesee H S (Camilius) Sleepy Hollow H S	X			X F	ort lotten ort Yates - ··· Gration	3205 8175 8176	Standing Rock Comm H S Grafton H S	x	0 X	°		Delaware	8229 3316	Defiance Sr H S Onio Wesleyan Univ	X	X	x	X
	Troy	9715 8782	Catholic Central H S Troy H S	x			Ŷ	Grand Forks Narvey	3218 8177 8179	Univ of North Dakota Harvey H S Hetmoner H S	XXX	x	XXX	X	Dover Dover Dubin	8230 8231 9335	Dover HS Dublin HS	Ŷ	χ.	x x	x ·
[Tuly Ulica - Valey Striam	8384 2818 9962	Tully Cantral H S Monawk Valley C C Central H S	X	1	X	X	amastown anniara	3200 8180	Jamestown Coll Kenmare H S	X	X	XXX	X	East Osveland East Liverpool Fimore	9115 3225 8720	Shaw H S Kent St Univ E Liverpool Woodmore H S	X	x	Â	X
	Vestal Walton	8164 8153	Vestal H S Watton Jr Sr H S Watton H S	X		x	X	angdon	8181 8189	Langdon Public H S Burke Central School	Î	o			Elyna	8233 3287	Elyna H S Lorain County Comm Coll	Š	XXX	XXX	X
	Waterloo Waterlown	9469 8213	Waterloo Sr H S ettemaculate Heart H S				<u>ŝ</u>	unton Jabon Aandaree	8170 8185 6857	Linton H S Liston H S Mandaree Public School	×	x	0		Fairbeld	8234 8235	Fairborn H S Fairlield H S	XX	X	XX	X
	Watkins Gien Webster	7640 8160	Wattuns Gien H S Websair H S	x	`	Ŷ	2 h	Azyville AcCausky Anot	3212 6222 6836	Mayville St Univ McClusky H S Minot H S, Maoic City Camous		X	ľ		Fannew Fan Fincastle Findlay	3274 8236	Southern St Comm Coll Findlay H S	Ŷ	Ŷ	XX	Ŷ
	Westbury Westbury Westburgen Bch	8215 8154 9450	Welswile H S Westbury H S Westremoton Bch Sr H S	X		x		Achal	3214 6859	Minot St Univ Mohall Public School Fort Berthold Comm Coll	X	X	XX	X	Fostona Fredericktown	3337 8237 8232	Fostoria H S Fredenciktown H S	Ŷ	x	1	ÎŶ.
	Wokamson Wikamsvile Woxcott	9976 2740 9029	Weiwartson H.S. Ene Comm Coll North Rose Wolcott H.S.	X		X	XIC)akas	8183 8204	New Town H S Dakes Elementary School	X	X	X		Fremont Gaharina Galion	8238 9019 9581	Ross H S Lincoln H S Galion Sr H S	Ř	X	X	X
	Yorkshire Yorktown Hts	7031 9209 9065	Pioneer Central H S Yoncown H S Lewight Protect Sr H S	XXX		X	XS	iolon alley City	9601 3216	Solen School Valley Crty St Univ	x	N X	Ĵ	x	Galipolis Galioway Graenalis	8239 8438 8240	Galia Acad H S Westland H S Greenville Sr H S	X	X	X X X X	X
			and a second second second second second second second second second second second second second second second		•••	- '	1	vanceton Vashbum	3206 8493	NU ST COR OF SCIENCE Washburn H S	- IX	14	χι×	1*	Grove City	9326	Grove City H S	(X	1	15	IX.
	· · · ·	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			•		· · ·	•	20	•				Continued on nex	t page					
							· .		-	· · · ·							•				
							•														

192

.

	City	Code Test Center	Oct. 23, 1933	LINC. 11, 1993 D	Apr. 9, 1994	City	Code	Test Center	Oct. 23, 1959	Feb. 5, 1994	Apr. 9, 1994 Jun. 11, 1994	City Cox	Q e Tent	Centor	Oct. 23, 1993	Dec. 11, 1993 Feb. 5, 1994	Apr. 9, 1994 Jun. 11, 1994		
Name Size Apering Size Apering Size Apering Apering Apering Apering Apering Apering Apering Approx)hio, cont.	B115 Badin H S	۱. ۲	X]	s i și ș	Westiake Wheelersburg Whitehouse	8303 8304 9288	Westlake H S Wheelersburg H S Anthony Wayne H S	XXX		x x	775 343 344	Union HS Univ Center al Univ of Tulsa	Tulsa	XXX	XXXXX	XXXXXXX		
	annibal anoverton	B363 River H S 6742 United H S	, X	Ì	Ĵ	Willoughby Wintersville Wooster	9109 8305 8306	W E South H S Wintersville H S Edoewood Jr H S	XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	X.	XXX	834 834 Warner 339	5 Washington H 5 Webster Sr H 2 Connors St Co	S S M	X	X X X X	X	7	
Sciel Sciel <th< td=""><td>idiard ubbard</td><td>9379 Hilkard H S 8775 Hubbard H S</td><td>x x</td><td>È.</td><td>, î î</td><td>Xenia</td><td>3260 8307 8309</td><td>The Coll of Wooster Xenia H S Austratown Fitch H S</td><td>XX</td><td>X</td><td>XXX</td><td>Watonga 616 Weatherford 344 669</td><td>Watonga H S Southwestern Weatherford H</td><td>OK St Univ</td><td>XXX</td><td>×××</td><td>хх</td><td></td><td></td></th<>	idiard ubbard	9379 Hilkard H S 8775 Hubbard H S	x x	È.	, î î	Xenia	3260 8307 8309	The Coll of Wooster Xenia H S Austratown Fitch H S	XX	X	XXX	Watonga 616 Weatherford 344 669	Watonga H S Southwestern Weatherford H	OK St Univ	XXX	×××	хх		
 Altern M. Schlander Strand Stra	ent	8243 tromon H S 3284 Kent St Univ 8244 Roosevent H S	x x	X () X ()	x x x	1 Congstown	8476 9577	Boardman H.S. Campbell Memorial H.S.	XX	X	ž ž	Wilburton 339 Woodward 834	Eastern OK St Woodward H	Coll	X	××	XX		
Bit Burnet 16 3 Bit Source 17 3 Bit Source	ellering msman axewood	8246 Kenering Fairmont H S 9504 Badger H S 8247 Lakewood H S		X) X X)			6750 6677	South H S Ursuline H S	XX	X	ŶŶ	Harrah 944 Tuisa 841	Oklahoma Aca 5 Tulsa Adventis	idemy st Academy		12	10		
main bits bits <th< td=""><td>ancaster evisbum</td><td>8319 St Edward H S 8248 Lancaster Sr H S 9431 Tri County North H S</td><td>X</td><td>×)</td><td>(X x</td><td>Zanesville OHIO Non-Setur</td><td>3322 day Te</td><td>Ohio Univ Zanasville</td><td> x x</td><td>Ŷ</td><td>ŶŶ</td><td>OREGON</td><td>Ashland H S</td><td></td><td>11</td><td>xIx</td><td>tx I ·</td><td></td><td></td></th<>	ancaster evisbum	8319 St Edward H S 8248 Lancaster Sr H S 9431 Tri County North H S	X	×)	(X x	Zanesville OHIO Non-Setur	3322 day Te	Ohio Univ Zanasville	x x	Ŷ	ŶŶ	OREGON	Ashland H S		11	xIx	tx I ·		
Andrey EX2 Lossen H B Communic EX2 Lossen H B Andrey CD Andre	ima ishon	8249 Lima Sr H S 6265 Shawnee H S 9343 Beaver Local H S	XX	×)		Centarville Cincinnati	6119 8207	Spring Valley Academy Jewish Vocational Service	24	6	10 12	Beaverton 836 788 Band 345	Beaverton H S Sunset H S Central Oreno	n Comm Coll	X	x x	×x	-1.1	
Consume Consume <t< td=""><td>ondon yndhurst</td><td>9923 London H S 8311 Charles F Brush H S</td><td>XX</td><td>x)</td><td></td><td>Columbus Dayton</td><td>8312 9129</td><td>Beth Jacob Congregation Dayton Jewish Comm Ctr</td><td>24 12</td><td>6</td><td>12</td><td>Burns 835 Coos Bay 349</td><td>Burns HS Southwestern</td><td>Oregon C C</td><td>X</td><td>Ϋ́,</td><td>х,</td><td></td><td></td></t<>	ondon yndhurst	9923 London H S 8311 Charles F Brush H S	XX	x)		Columbus Dayton	8312 9129	Beth Jacob Congregation Dayton Jewish Comm Ctr	24 12	6	12	Burns 835 Coos Bay 349	Burns HS Southwestern	Oregon C C	X	Ϋ́,	х,		
 Aline Grand	anchester ansheld	8254 Manchester H S Adams Co 8255 Mansfield Sr H S	x x		ŝ	Ketlering Mt Vernon	3279 8267	Kettering Coll of Medical Arts Mt Vernon Academy	12		10 10	Eugene 902 661	North Eugene South Eugene	нs Hs	Ŷ	x x	X		
Basker Size Mining	larion larysville	3311 Ohio St Univ Marion - 6858 Maryswhe H S	x x	ŝļŝ	ŶŶŶ	OKLAHO	VIA 6796	Byng H'S		X	xx	Grams Pass 349 Gresham 347	Roque Comm Mt Hood Com	Coll m Coll	×	x	×x	12	
Under Visit Y <th< td=""><td>lassillon laumee</td><td>9354 Perry H.S. 8260 Washington H.S. 9333 Maumee H.S.</td><td>x ;</td><td>x ;</td><td>XX</td><td>Altus Alva</td><td>3394 3378 3412</td><td>East Central Univ Western DK St Coll Northwestern OK St Univ</td><td>XXX</td><td>XXX</td><td>XXXXXX</td><td>Heppner 841 Independence 655 Jordan Valley \$77</td><td>Central H S Jordan Valley</td><td>нs</td><td>ľ</td><td>X</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>	lassillon laumee	9354 Perry H.S. 8260 Washington H.S. 9333 Maumee H.S.	x ;	x ;	XX	Altus Alva	3394 3378 3412	East Central Univ Western DK St Coll Northwestern OK St Univ	XXX	XXX	XXXXXX	Heppner 841 Independence 655 Jordan Valley \$77	Central H S Jordan Valley	нs	ľ	X			
Globard File EXX X	aylield Vig edina lentor	7913 Mayheid H S 8261 Medina Sr H S 8262 Mentor H S	x x			Andarko Antiers Ardinore	5461 9799 8320	Andarko H S Antiers H S Ardmore H S	X x	X	XXXXX	La Grande 836 La Kende 906	Cregon Instol La Grande H S Lakeridge H S	119071	x	Ŷŗ.	XX		
Am EST Estern Fill Behaving is the provided of the p	iddieburg Hts iddietown	8263 Midpark H S 3 3299 Miami U Middletown Carrt 8264 Middletown H S	XXX		XXX	Bartiesville	8321 3387 8326	Bartlesville H S Bartlesville Wesleyan Coll Beaver H S	XXX	x	X X X	Milweukie 648 Newport 612 Ontario 349	Mikwaukoe H S Newport H S 7 Treasure Valie	w C C	XXX	x x	· · X		
Verden - 588 Mil Wonnert 15	ian Hord	8921 Edison H S 8265 Millord H S 9374 Lake H S	XXX	×)		Bethany	6478 3384	Bethany H S Southern Nazarene Univ	XX	X	XXX	Oregon City 346 908 Pendleton 345	5 Clackamas Co 9 Oregon City S 5 Blue Mountair	mm Coll rHS Comm Coll	x	x x	x x		
Ever Consort 15 X	t Vernon	9280 Mt Vernon H S 3372 Mt Vernon Nazarene Coli 9182 Natriann H S	X Y X	x	XX	Boise City	8330 9372	Boise City H S Bristow H S Bristow A Source St H S	×,	, X	X X	Portland 835 835 Proine City 944	Cleveland H S Parkrose H S Praine City H		X	× ×	XX		
Bit Mark Control Contro Contro <thcontrol< th=""> <thc< td=""><td>w London w Phila</td><td>6150 New London H S 8269 Kent St Univ, Tuscarawas Car 2000 Data St Univ, Tuscarawas Car</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Chickasha Chickasha Chickasha</td><td>3418 6138</td><td>Univ of Sci & Arus of Okla Eastern Oklahoma Co Vo Tech</td><td>Î X X</td><td>Ŷ</td><td>Ş Ş</td><td>Roseburg 350 Salem 349</td><td>2 Umpqua Com 3 Chemeketa Co 5 Somous H S</td><td>m Coll omm Coll</td><td>X</td><td>XX</td><td>хX</td><td></td><td></td></thc<></thcontrol<>	w London w Phila	6150 New London H S 8269 Kent St Univ, Tuscarawas Car 2000 Data St Univ, Tuscarawas Car				Chickasha Chickasha Chickasha	3418 6138	Univ of Sci & Arus of Okla Eastern Oklahoma Co Vo Tech	Î X X	Ŷ	Ş Ş	Roseburg 350 Salem 349	2 Umpqua Com 3 Chemeketa Co 5 Somous H S	m Coll omm Coll	X	XX	хX		
Optimization Science HS C x X x <thx th="" x<=""> X x X x</thx>	ewark des orth Olmsted	B271 McKinley H S 8272 North Okristed H S	Î x x	ŝļŝ	ŶŶ	Del City	3420 8322	Ropers St Coll Del City H S	Ŷ.	Ŷ	ŶŶ	Sandy 928 Scacobose 899	Scappoose H	l\$ S	x	χ X		124	
region 6829 Linear Linear 6829 Linear Linear 100 region 6829 Canan Canan Second Toy Advertish School 22 6 100 region 6829 Canan Canan Second Toy Advertish School 22 6 100 region 6829 Franchall 6829 Noncold Advertish School 22 6 100 region 6277 Horm TS X	orth Royatton orwalk orwood	9264 North Hoyaton H S 8274 Norwalk H S 8275 Norwood H S	x x	×,	XX	Duncan Durant Edmond	8323 3438 3390	Duncan H S Southeastern OK St Univ The Univ of Central Okishoma	XXX	X	XXX	OREGON Non-Saturd	y Test Centers			12	10	14.27	
stod 224 Martin Umv X	regon Ttaws	6249 Caroinal Stritch H S 8292 Clay H S 8461 Ottawa Glandorf H S	× ×	× ;	XX	El Reno Enid	6869 3398 9252	El Reno H S Redianós Comm Coll	XX	X	x x x x	Lincoln City 896 Portland 835	Seventh Day / Portland Adve	dventist School ntist Academy	24	¹² 6	10 10		
Sport Sport <th< td=""><td>xford ainesville</td><td>3294 Miani Univ 8276 Talawanda H S 8277 Harvey H S</td><td>XXX</td><td>x </td><td>XX</td><td>Fairfax</td><td>6689 6143 6838</td><td>Oklahoma Bible Academy Woodland H S Frederick H S</td><td>XXX</td><td>X</td><td>XXX</td><td>PENNSYLVA Alexandria 886</td><td>NIA Juniata Valley</td><td>HS</td><td>ÍŃ</td><td></td><td>i×i,</td><td></td><td></td></th<>	xford ainesville	3294 Miani Univ 8276 Talawanda H S 8277 Harvey H S	XXX	x	XX	Fairfax	6689 6143 6838	Oklahoma Bible Academy Woodland H S Frederick H S	XXX	X	XXX	PENNSYLVA Alexandria 886	NIA Juniata Valley	HS	ÍŃ		i×i,		
anna Hadning S279 Value From Park S289 Learning Park S289 Learning Park S289 Learning Park S289 Learning Park S289 Learning Park S289 Learning Park S289 Learning Park S289 Learning Park S289 Learning Park S289 Learning Park S289 Learning Park S289 Learning Park S289 Learning Park S289 Learning Park S289 Learning Park S289 Learning Park S289 Learning Park S289 Learning Park S280 Learn	ama	9284 Riverside H S 8282 Normandy H S 8278 Parma Sr H S	XXX		XX	Goodwell Guthne	3426 9772 8324	Panhandle St Univ Guthrie H S Hohart H S	XXX	X	X X	Altoona 835 Beaver Falls 836	Altoona Area Beaver Falls S	HS HS		Ŷ	xŶ		
Bind Diriz X	arma Heights autoing	8279 Valey Forge H S 6312 Paulong H S 9765 Externed In H S	XX	(<u> </u>)		klabel Janks	9107 9189	Duniap Ctr for Higher Ed Jenks H S	××		, x	Bethei Park 836 Betheinen 992	Bethel Park S Uberty H S	нs	Ŷ	XX	XX		
celestrychi 2010 Feilindelinis A X X X X X X X X X X X </td <td>epper Pike</td> <td>9174 Orange H S 3323 • Owens Technical Coll</td> <td>- XXX</td> <td>ġ</td> <td>x x</td> <td>Lawton</td> <td>3385</td> <td>Cameron Univ Lawton H S</td> <td>XX</td> <td>X</td> <td>х х</td> <td>Brookville 970 Butter 837</td> <td>5 Northampton 1 Brookville H S 3 Butler Area Sr</td> <td>HS</td> <td>XX</td> <td>x</td> <td>χx x</td> <td></td> <td></td>	epper Pike	9174 Orange H S 3323 • Owens Technical Coll	- XXX	ġ	x x	Lawton	3385	Cameron Univ Lawton H S	XX	X	х х	Brookville 970 Butter 837	5 Northampton 1 Brookville H S 3 Butler Area Sr	HS	XX	x	χx x		
Column Disk X	ckerington) r keton	7319 Pickengton H S 6420 Vem Riffe Joint Voc School	. Îx) () ŝ	Miami Miami Mixiwest City	3405 8325	Northeastern OK A & M Coll Carl Albert Sr H S	x x	Ŷ	XXX	Canonsburg 837 Clarion 990 Clarks Summit 837	3 Canon McMilli 2 Clarion Area h 5 Abington Hts	an Sr H S IS H S North Campus	s X	XX	XX		
3333 State Statements St. Univ X <td< td=""><td>onsmouth :</td><td>9285 Port Clinton H S 8856 Portsmouth H S</td><td>x x</td><td></td><td>x x</td><td>Muskogee</td><td>3403 3380</td><td>Rose St Col Bacone Coll</td><td>x x</td><td>Ŷ</td><td>x x</td><td>Clearfield 839 Coal Center 837 Coalesville 838</td><td>Clearfield Area California Area Coatesville Ar</td><td>a HS a HS aa Sr HS</td><td>X</td><td>X</td><td>xx</td><td></td><td></td></td<>	onsmouth :	9285 Port Clinton H S 8856 Portsmouth H S	x x		x x	Muskogee	3403 3380	Rose St Col Bacone Coll	x x	Ŷ	x x	Clearfield 839 Coal Center 837 Coalesville 838	Clearfield Area California Area Coatesville Ar	a HS a HS aa Sr HS	X	X	xx		
b) Girande 324 Um of Rio Grande X X X X Dowinggrown 6735 Dowinggrown 6735 Dowinggrown 6735 Dowinggrown 6735 Dowinggrown 6735 Dowinggrown 7735 Dowinggrown <td< td=""><td>ut-In-Bay eynolosburg</td><td>3335 Shawhee St Univ 9769 Put-to-Bay H S 9528 Reynoldsburg H S</td><td>x x</td><td>ĺ</td><td>Ŷ,</td><td>Newcastie</td><td>6618 6843 6654</td><td>Muskogee H S Newcastie Middle School Nobie H S</td><td>XXX</td><td>x</td><td>X</td><td>Corry 967 Dannile 837 Derry 837</td><td>5 Corry Area H 5 Danwile Area 7 Derry Area H</td><td>SrHS SrHS</td><td></td><td>×</td><td>X</td><td></td><td></td></td<>	ut-In-Bay eynolosburg	3335 Shawhee St Univ 9769 Put-to-Bay H S 9528 Reynoldsburg H S	x x	ĺ	Ŷ,	Newcastie	6618 6843 6654	Muskogee H S Newcastie Middle School Nobie H S	XXX	x	X	Corry 967 Dannile 837 Derry 837	5 Corry Area H 5 Danwile Area 7 Derry Area H	SrHS SrHS		×	X		
amil Claramine X	ic Grande ocky River	3324 Univ of Rio Grande , 8283 Rocky River H S 7028 Rossford H S	XXX	×	XXX	Norman	6321 3442 9656	OK Sch Sci & Math Univ of Okishoma Oaks H S	X X	x	XX	Downingtown 673 Elwood City 838	Downingtown Lincoln HS	Sr H S	×	x	. X	24	
Andrusy B24K Security B24K	ant Clarsville - ant Henry Liem -	3317 Ohio Univ Eastern 7681 St Henry H S 3354 Kent St Univ Salem	X X X X	x) x)		Oklahoma City	8380 3415 3431	Mt St Mary H S Oktahoma Christ U Sci & Arts Oktahoma City Comm Coli	XXX	x	XXX	Ene 357 954	Gannon Univ McDowell H S		X	××	x		
oney 9165 Solicy HS X X X 8810 Portuan Cirly West St HS X X X X Instructure Cirly Constant School X	andusky haker Heights helby	8284 Sancusky H S 8285 Snakur Heights H S 8286 Snakur Heights H S		K) K) K)			3416 3423 8332	Oklahoma City Univ Oklahoma St Univ Putnam City H S	XXX	X	XXXX	Franklin 962 Greensburg 840	5 Frankin Area Hempheid Are	Jr Sr H S a Sr H S	X	XX V	X		
Story Holl X	oney bion him Point	9165 Somey H S B256 Solon H S R270 South Point H S	× x	ĸ	xx	Otimutana	9810 8343	Putnam City West Sr H S U S Grant H S OSIL Overviewe	XXX	XXX	X X X	Hamsburg 663 Hamson City 667	Hamsburg Ch Hamsburg Ch Penn Trafford	ristan School High	ŷ	λ,	Î		
EXES Strongwile EXES X <td>proglieki</td> <td>8287 North HS 9785 Northwestern HS 3258 Franciscan Univ of Sauthermill</td> <td>. x x</td> <td>6</td> <td></td> <td>Owasao Pawnae</td> <td>9294 8812</td> <td>Owasso H S Pawnee Elementary School</td> <td>XXX</td> <td>X</td> <td>XX</td> <td>Hazieton 841 Indiana 370 Jermyn 940</td> <td>Indiana Univ c Lakeland H S</td> <td>f PA</td> <td>x</td> <td>x</td> <td>xx</td> <td>1</td> <td></td>	proglieki	8287 North HS 9785 Northwestern HS 3258 Franciscan Univ of Sauthermill	. x x	6		Owasao Pawnae	9294 8812	Owasso H S Pawnee Elementary School	XXX	X	XX	Hazieton 841 Indiana 370 Jermyn 940	Indiana Univ c Lakeland H S	f PA	x	x	xx	1	
Analoge 2015 Stanzaporte* 6388 Mestantery HS X <td< td=""><td>rongsvile ruthers</td><td>1288 Strangsville Sr H S 1289 Strangers H S 1294 Strangers H S</td><td>XXX</td><td></td><td></td><td>Perty Ponce City</td><td>6125 8334</td><td>Perry HS Ponce City Sr HS</td><td>X X</td><td>X</td><td>ž,</td><td>Johnstown 373 Lancaster 839 Lancisville 660</td><td>5 Univ of Philson 5 Conestoga Va 8 Hempfield H S</td><td>key H S</td><td>` Ŷ</td><td>x</td><td>Ŷ^</td><td>3×7 •</td><td></td></td<>	rongsvile ruthers	1288 Strangsville Sr H S 1289 Strangers H S 1294 Strangers H S	XXX			Perty Ponce City	6125 8334	Perry HS Ponce City Sr HS	X X	X	ž,	Johnstown 373 Lancaster 839 Lancisville 660	5 Univ of Philson 5 Conestoga Va 8 Hempfield H S	key H S	` Ŷ	x	Ŷ^	3×7 •	
mm 2331 Carl Dometrizade H S X X X X Savena 115 Saboda H S K V Syne X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	elmadge ve Plans	9792 Talmadge H S 6706 Athens H S	x x	×	, X X	Pryor Sand Springs	6333 6361	Pryor H S Churles Page H S	ÎŶ x	Î	Ŷ	Langhorne* 838 Latrobe 957 Lebanoti 618	8 Nestiaminy H 9 Greater Latrol 5 Cedar Crest H	S beSrHS IS	. x	x	X		
E231 EL Constant HS X X X Sentinel HS Z X Sentinel HS Z X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	wedo	5264 Central Cetholic H S 5577 Davis Col	ĴŶ,	Ì	xx	Sapupa Sayre Seminole	3434 3436	Section Sectio	Î X X	x	x x	Lower Buttell 838 McConnelisburg 839 McConnelisburg 675	7 Burrell H S 1 McConnellsbu 1 Fort Cherry H	ng H S	x	×	xx		
9784 Roover HS X X X X Media 3542 Delaware County CC X X X X		6231 EL Bowsher H S 6248 Note Dame Academy 8293 Ottawe Hills H S	x,	,		Sentinel Shawnee Sbiwater	9513 3414 3424	Sentinel H S Oklahoma Baptist Univ Oklahoma St Univ	XX	X	XXX	McKeesport 839 Meadville 839	2 McKeesport A 3 Meadville Are	IN ST HS	XXX	x	X x		
2694 ROY USB/TIS A A A A A A Shwell "Bitto Solveet HS A A A A A Shwell "Bitto Solveet HS A A A A A A A Shwell "Bitto Solveet HS A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A		9784 Rogers HS 8294 Roy C Start HS 9779 St Johns HS	XXX	¥),		Stiwel	9807 5195 3408	Stilwater H S Stilwell H S Northeastern OK St U	XXX	XXX	X X X X	Media 354 Monaca 354	2 Delaware Cou 5 Comm Coll of Browniel J	nty C C Beaver Co	X	XXX	X X		
2344 The Univ of Toledo X X X X X Tacumseh 6130 Tacumseh HS X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	intogeny	3344 The Univ of Toledo 9778 Oblaco HS 8296 Trov HS	XX	x)		Tecumseh Tishomingo	6130 3402 3410	Tecumseh H S Murray St Coll Northern DK Coll	XXX	x	x	Moon Twp 704 New Castle 842	5 Moon Sr H S New Castle S	หร	Ŷ	x	× ×		
póer Sandusky 2296 Upóer Sandusky Sr H S X X X X Usa 8335 Bishop Kefery H S X X X X Hewtown B557 Council Rock H S A X X X A 8335 Central Sr H S X X X X Philadelphia 3724 Temple Univ	poer Sandusky mana en Wert	8298 Upper Sendusky Sr H S 3345 Urbena Univ 8299 Van Wert H S	XX	ĸ,	XXX	Tuisa	8335 8336	Bishop Kelley HS Central Sr HS East Central Sr HS	× ×	X	xx	Newtown B86 Philadelphia 372	Council Area H Council Rock Temple Univ	йs		х х	Ŷx	Ì	
adsworth 5000 Wacsworth SFHS X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	adsworth arren	5300 Watsworth Sr H S 6301 Warsworth Sr H S 6301 Warsen G Harding H S		ś),	XXX		8338 8339	Edison Sr H S Hale Sr H S	x x	X	x x	Fritisburgh 840 957 840	2 Baldwin HS 8 Fox Chapel A 7 Penn Hills Sr	nea HS HS	X	X	x [^]		

ACT Test Centers

.

*Non-Saturday test centers are listed at the end of each state. See page 11 for eligibility, a your counselor for the test date.

City Code Test Center	Oct 23, 1993 Dec. 11, 1993 Feb. 5, 1994 Apr. 9, 1994	1000 100	Code Test Center	Oct. 23, 1993 Dec. 11, 1993 Feb. 5, 1994 Apr. 9, 1994 Jun. 11, 1994	Слу	Code Test Center	Oct. 23, 1993	Cec. 11, 1993 Feb. 5, 1994	Apr. 9, 1994	Jun. 11, 1994
Pennsylvania, cont. Pottstown 354 Oven J Roberts H S 9507 St Pus X H S 8555 The Hill School Sant Marys & Att 1 Sant Marys Area H S Seinsgrove 8018 Seinsgrove Area H S	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	Clinton Collegedale Collierville Columbia	3978 Lee Coll 8471 Canton H S 8472 Collegetaie Academy 5425 Collegetaie Academy 5673 Collemble H S 8673 Collemble Central H S 3953 Collemble St Comm Coll 8193 Technistic Technical	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	Sparta Springheld Strawberry Pins Summertown Sweetwatar Tuliahoma Warthwn	9960 White Country H S 8462 Springheld H S 9673 Carter H S 6666 Summentown H S 8514 Sweetwater H S 8516 Tuilanoma H S 8517 Central H S	******	x x x x	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	XXX
Selersville 5290 Faith Christian Academy 6298 Upper Bucks Christian School Sharon 3652 Penn St Univ Sheriango C 7264 Sharon Sr H S Shalington 7756 Governor Mithin Sr H S Shancinetae 6241 O toward Valler Jr Sr H S		X Cosby / Covington Crossville Cunningham Dayton	5277 Cosby H S 9674 Connigtion H S 8474 Connigtion H S 6648 Montgomery Central High 4038 Bryan Col		Waverly Winchester TENNESSEE No Dayton Koncrolle	8506 Waverly Central H S 8518 Frankin County H S on-Saturday Test Centers* 8475 Laurebrook School	XX	x x 12 6	x 10	x
Soudenton 8414 Soudenton Area Sr H S Trusvie 9188 Trusvie H S Troy 6703 Troy Sr H S Uniontown 9334 Laurel Highlands H S Washington 8534 Trinty H S	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	X Dover Duniap Dyer X Dversburg Ekrabeltron	8745 Decision Co H S 9903 Stewart County H S 7648 Sequatione Co H S 9809 Goson County H S 3969 Dyersburg St Comm Coll 8478 Evaatembor H S		Madison Memphis Nashvile Portand	8496 Madison Academy 9608 Memphis St Univ 9493 Tennessee St Univ 8510 Highland Academy	24 24 24	12 6 12 6 12 6 12 6	10 10 10	12
West Chester _ 633 8 Reed Handerson H S West Lawn _ 6311 Wisson H S Westord _ 8400 North Allegheny Sr H S Wiskord _ 8400 North Allegheny Sr H S Wikers Barre _ 3634 Kings Coll, Wisamsport _ 3737 Penn Coll of Tech	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	X Englewood Fayetteville Franklin X Gallatin	8479 Central H S of McMinn Co 8559 Lincoln County H S 5375 Franklin H S 7754 Fred J Page H S 4037 Volunteer St Comm Col 8650 County of Remote H S	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	Addison Alce	4050 Abilene Christian Univ 4096 Hardin Simmons Univ 4130 Michlumy Univ 6354 Trinny Christian Acad 8519 Alaon H S	X X X	****	XXXXX	XX
York 8419 Central York H S. PENHSYLVANIA Non-Saturday Test Centers' Hamburg 8355 Biue Mountain Academy Pine Force 8400 Pine Force Academy DU-ODE ICL AND	X X X 24 12 6 10	Catinburg Germantown Greenaville Harriman	8033 Garmanow H S 9032 Germanow H S 6406 Houston H S 8481 Greenewile H S , 7605 South Greene H S 3985 Roare St Comm Col	×××× ×	Alist Alien Alpine Alvin Amarilo	9575 Aller Hasting H S N 8990 Aller H S 4190 Sur Ross St Univ 4054 Alvin Comm Coll 4056 Amartilio Coll 6578 Randali H S	*****	* * * * * *	XXXXX	x x x
E Greenwich 922 Rocky Hill School SOUTH CAROLINA Bamberg - 532 Bamberg Exhault H.S. Beautort - 5835 Beautor Reg Conv USC	x x x x x x x x	X Harrogate Henderson Hendersonville Hixson Huntsville Jacksboro	3992 Lincoln Memorial Univ 8938 Chester County H S 7804 Henderschwile H S 9793 Hixton H S 8490 Scott H S 8491 Campbell Co Comp H S		Andrews Angleton Arlington Athens Atlanta	9042 Andrews Sr H S 9633 Angleton H S 4200 U of TX at Arington 4098 Trivity Valley Comm Col 6637 Asianta H S	×××	XXXX	XXXX	XXXX
Bennettsville 653 Martboro County H S Charleston 3846 Coll of Charleston Columbia 9418 Columbia H S 6822 Irmo H S Converty 3843 USC Coast Carolina Coll Forward 6577 West Roomed H S	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	X Jackson X Jamestown Jefferson City	3974 Lambuth Univ 9248 South Skiel H S 4020 Union Univ 8482 York Agnouthural Institute 3950 Carson Newman Col 2958 Event TN St Union	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	Ballinger	4104 Huston Tilotson Col 8269 Lake Travis H S 8525 Reagan H S 8524 Walam B Travis H S 9587 Balanger H S	XXX	****	xx	XX
Georgetown 6736 Georgetown H S Greenville 8477 Bob Jones Academy Greenwood 5721 Greenwood H S 3850 Lander Univ Hitton Head H S	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	X Jonesborough X Knosvile	8453 Scence Hill H S 8578 David Crockett H S 8484 Oobyrs Bennett H S 8039 Bearden H S 9761 Fairragut H S	(X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	Baytown Beaumont Berville Beiton Big Spring Bianco	4118 Lee Coll 4114 Lamar Univ 4054 Bee County Coll 8848 Beeton H S 4100 Howard Coll 7728 Blanco H S	XXX	*** **	****	XXX X
Hoose Fath	* * * * * * * *	X Lalayene	4021 Peliasipol St Tech C C 8489 South Doyle H S 4026 Univ of Ternessee 9826 West H S 8490 Macon County H S 8490 Lawrence C H S	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	Borger Brady Breckenndge Brenham Brownlield	4092 Frank Philips Coll 8972 Brady Schools 9425 Breckenndge H S 4068 Bienn Coll 6712 Brownfield H S	X	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	X X X	XX X
Seneca 6746 Seneca H S Sparanburg 8466 Sparanburg H S Summer 8430 Summer H S SOUTH DAKOTA - Abactaen 3916 Northern St Univ		X Lebanon Lenoir City Lexington Livingston	8955 Lebanon H S 8608 Lenor Chy H S 8535 Letwington H S 8494 Livington Academy 8998 Louison H S 8555 Comparison Protocol		Brownwood Bryan Buda	4218 Univ of Texas at Brownsville 6687 Brownwood H S 4102 Howard Payne Univ 8528 Bryan H S 8595 Jack C Hays H S	XX XX	****	****	XXXX
Brookings 3924 South Dakota St Univ Burtalo 9045 Harding Country H S Chambertain I. 8439 Chambertain H S Eagle Burta 8440 Cheyrene Eagle Burta H S Fach Burta 441 Fath H S Backeaut 6447 Fath H S		X Madisonville Martin Maryville	2966 Huwasee College 4032 Univ of TN at Martan - 8214 Hentage H S 8497 Maryville H S 8752 William Biount H S	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	Burnet Burnet Canadian Canyon Carnzo Spgs Carrolton	8980 Burret H S 8980 Burret H S 9710 Canadan H S 4250 West Teaas St Univ L 8671 Carruo Springs H S 9047 Newman Smith H S	x	****	****	XXX
Freeman 9738 Freeman Academy Genysburg 8442 Genysburg HS Hot Springs 8443 Hot Springs HS Huron 3912 Huron Univ Kadoka 6304 Kadoka HS	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	McMinnvile Memphis X	8495 Warren Co Sr H S 8459 Briarcrest Christian Schools 8611 Carver H S 9480 Central H S 8498 Christian Brothers H S	××××××××××××××××××××××××××××××××××××××	Carthage Cedar Hill Chidress Clarendon Cleburne College Station	4144 Panola Col 8953 Cecar Hill H S 9593 Chicress H S 4076 Clarendon Col 9380 Carourne H S 4198 Texas A & M Univ	* ****	****	****	x
Madison 5910 Dakota Si Univ Martin 8447 Bennett County H S Michtosh 7041 Michaosh H S Michaophin 8404 Michaophin H S Miler 845 Miller H S	X X X 0 0	X	6031 East h 5 8855 Evangelcal Christian School 6104 Fairley H S 9850 Frai Assembly Otvistian Sch 9541 Hamitton H S 3980 Le Moyne Owen Col	*** **********************************	Colorado City Columbus Commerce Converse Converse Converse	6410 Colorado H S 8533 Columbus H S 4068 East Texas St Univ 8754 Convoe H S 8657 Judson H S 9200 Cocreel H S	* ***	XXX	****	x
Missel 3905 Dakota Westran Univ Missel 3905 Dakota Westran Univ 8445 Missel Sr H S Mobridge 8450 Moondoje H S Pierre 8453 Rigst H S Pierre 8453 Rigst H S	x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x x	x x x	3984 Memphis Area Yoc Tach Schoo 3992 Memphis St Univ 6325 Northside H S 6572 Shelby State C C 9981 White Station H S 6164 Wooddae H S	* × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × ×	Corpus Christi Corsicana	4082 Dei Mar Coll East Cam 9856 Richard King H S 8526 Tudos-Moway H S 6691 Considered H S 4134 Navamo Coll	*****	*** ***	** **	*** **
Rapd Crity 3922 SD Sch of Mines & Tech Sant Francis 9423 SI Francis Indian School Socus Fails 3902 Augustana Coli 3920 Socus Fails Coli	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	X Melington Morristown X Mt Juliet X Muniord 12	8500 Millington Central H S 8501 Morristown Hamblen H S East 9381 Morristown Hamblen H S West 8631 Mt Juliet H S 9522 Munitort H S 9994 Michiel TN St Leve		Crandali Dalvert Datias	9751 Crandall HS 8531 Dahan Sr HS 6140 David W Carter HS 6135 H Grady Spruce HS 8347 Hockaday School	*****	***	****	***
Speartah 3904 Black Hills St Univ Stephan B415 Crow Creek Res H 5 Vermilion 3728 Univ of South Dakota 3728 Vermilion H 5 Waterstown H 5 Woow B459 Waterstown H 5	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	X X X X	6653 Cakland High School 3946 Beimont Unw 3956 David Lipscomb Univ 6768 Hume Fogs Academic H S 8503 John Overtion H S	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	De Soto Del Ric Del City	4059 Lincon h S 4069 Meuntain View Coll 8534 Thomas Jetterson H S 9385 De Soto H S 8536 Del Ric H S 9213 Del City H S	****	****	****	x
Yankion 3914 Mount Many Coll TENNESSEE Adamsville H 5 Adamsville H 5 Adamsville H 5 Adamsville Coll Mission		X Newborn	3983 Nashvile St Tech Inst 4010 Tennessee St U Main Cam 4036 Vanderbit Univ 6594 Dyer Co H S 8505 Cocke County H S		Denison Denton ', Dirnmit Dumas Duncanville Eacle Pass	4055 Grayson County Coll 4135 Univ of North Texas 9964 Dwmmtt H S 7034 Dumas H S 8425 Duncanville H S 8538 Eagle Pass H S	x x x	***	XX	XXX
Bountwile 8527 Sulwan Central H S Bolivar 8539 Bolivar Central H S Brenwood 9652 Birenwood H S Bristol 8464 Central H S Canden 8465 Central H S	*****	X Oneida X Paris X Paris X Parisons X Pulaski	eson Cak Hoge H S 8509 Oneda H S 8512 Henry County H S 9908 Riverside H S 6637 Gres Co H S 3985 Martin Methodist Coll		Edna Edna El Paso	4142 Univ of Texas Pan American 8951 Eona H S 8539 Austin H S 8540 Coronado H S 8739 Eastwood H S 4090 El Paso C C Vale Verde Cam	×××	*** ***	XXXXXXX	x
Larmage BBS/F Sinder Country H S Ceina 8456 Ceina H S D'artanooga 8455 Brainerd H S 8469 Chatanooga H S 8470 East Roge H S 9777 Ree Bank H S	x x x x x x x x x	Ripley Sant Andrews Savannah X Severvile X Severvile	 8511 Ripley H S 8513 St Andrew 's Sewanee School 8485 Handon County H S 8856 Michary Central H S 9322 Sever County H S 8796 County H S 		Evant	6479 Montwood H S 6450 Socorro H S 4223 Univ of Texas at El Paso 8541 Ysera H S 8844 Evant H S	XX	***	XX	x
- 4022 Usiv of TN Chattanooga Carksville 3944 Austin Prey St Univ 6644 Carssville Academy - 9714 Canssville H S Carreland 8453 Bradler Central H S	X X X X X X X X X X X X	X Smthvite Socioy-Darsy Somerville	9906 De Kalb County H S 6584 Sodoy-Dany H S 6852 Fayene Academy 9675 Fayette Ware Comp H S	X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	Fort Stockton Fort Worth	8543 Fort Stockton H S 8543 Fort Stockton H S 5868 Diamond Hill Jarvis H S 6245 Notan Catholic H S 9113 O D Wyatt H S	XXXX	XXX	XX	1

:" 22

24

Cont

ed on next page

		۰. ۱.			1831	2 1994	1661 1					11 1993	2 194	1, 1994	·		· ·	23, 1993	11, 1993	5. 1994	9. 1994
	City	Coxie	Test Conter	:	g,	5	Apr.	City	Ced	e Test Center		88	2	<u>¥I</u>	City	Code	Test Conier	8	8	6	ž
Texa	s, cont	6273	RictHand H S .	. ·	11	jx	1×1	Phart	6,274 5751	Phare San Juan Autoro Valley View H S	His North	XX	X	XXX	Montezuma Gr Montuceito	8591 8591	Whitehorse H S Monicelio H S Luxiertanti Valley H S	۰x	r o	0	X
		8757 4222	Southwost H S Texas Wesleyan Univ		X	X.	×	Plans	4246	Waytand Baptist Univ Coline Co Comm Coli		XX	X	XX	Hurzy	8610 6676	Morray H S Bonneviae H S	X	XX	X	X
Freedo	a .	8545	Brazosport HS			χĮ χ	× ľ	Pleasantro	8702	Plano Sr H S Pleasanton H S		XX	x	×		6629 4282	Option Sr H S Weber St Univ	X X	XX	XX	X
Gartest	vifa	8532 4094	Cooke County Coll	•	1ŝ	ž [x	X X	Port Lavaca	8945	Calhoun H S Fort Neches Groves H	s s	xx	×	x	Orem .	8592 4278	Orem H S Utah Vašey C C Orem Cam	X	X	X	X
Garland	1 ·	7022 8767	North Garland H S		Ŷ	2	x x	Praine View Presidio	4202 6520	Pravie View A & H Un Presidio H S	*• :	× x		X	Pangunch Preasant Grove	8593 9603	Farguitch H S Preasant Grove H S	· 13	X	x	X
Gidding Gemer	ж,	7198	Giddings HS		X	X	x	Progreso Quanah	8642 8566	Progreso H S Ouanah H S	.	X X	Ň		Prica Provo	4268	Eol of Eastern Utah Bugham Young Univ	ŝ	Ŷ	â	ž.
Gonzak Graham	es .	9066 9212	Gonzales H S Woodland Elementary Sci	hool	x	× x	X	Richardson Rio Grande City	8567	Rio Grande City H S		Ĵ	ŝ	ĴΪ,	Randolph	6379	Rich H S Birthf Mt H S	Ŷ	x	x	Ŷ
Grand F	ry Prairie	6667 8790	Grand Prairie H S		X	x x	XX	Rockwall	7757	Roctowal HS		ĵ,	Ŷ	21^	Roosevel	4263	Sevier Valley Tech	X	x		x
Bernito	n , '	8548	Hammon H S		X.	, X	I, ľ	Rosenberg Botan	9279	Terry H S Rouen ISD	1. j. 1	x	x	XXX	Roy Saint George	6627 4272	Roy H S Divie Col	X	x	x	X
HILLAN	*1	8424 8417	Harne Military Academy Hashell H S	•*	Ŷ	ξĮ ĝ	Ŷ,	Hound Rock San Angelo	7077	Round Rock H S Angelo St Univ		XX	XX	XXX	San Live City	8584 8597	Contonwood H S East H S	X	X	X	X
Heretor Hitsbor	d .	8989 4099	Hereford H S	• •	Ŷ		XX	San Antonio	6258 8529	Central H S Alamo Heights H S		XX	X	XX		8596 6341	Granger H S Grante H S	x	Ŷ	Ĵ	× :
Hondo Nousion	n .	\$112 6150	Hondo H S Cy Fair H S		XX	XX	x	1	144	East Central H S Engewood H S	• • •	Č ž		x x		6347	Kearns H S	·	Ŷ	â	Ŷ
	\sim	9569 8605	Cypress Creek Sr H S . Eisenhower H S	1	X	K X			6548	Li W Brackennoge H S Highlands H S		^ lậ	x	2	199 - 191 -	8595	Skywe HS Low of Utah	Î	x	X	X
۲. I		4105 9657	Houston Comm Coll Syste Jersey Village H S	-	X	X	X X		9111	John Marshall H S		x	X	xx	Sandy	9637 6335	Avest HS AT A STORE	X	X	x	X
•		4139	NOTO Harris Col		Î	Ŷ	Î X		4140 4158	Dur Lady of the Lake L Savit Mary's Univ -	kniv	XX	X	XXX	Smithfield Tooele	8502 8601	Scy View HS Topele HS	x	XX		X
		4165 8574	San Jacinto Cot North Ca Shamsteen Sr H S	1	x	ξĮχ.	X X		4166 #537	San Antonio Coll South San Antonio H S	Z.a.	XX	X	XXX	Vernal Wendover	8602 8770	Uniah H S Wendover H S	2. X	, X		X
		8542	Sonng Woods Sr H S Texas Southern Univ	۰.	X	XX	XXX		\$350 4239	Southside H S Univ of Texas San Art	onio	ž ž	x	ŝ	West Jordan Woods Cross	9451	Woods Cross H S	Î	Ŷ		X
		4170 4235	Univ of Houston Downtow Univ of Houston, Main Ca	impus	X	XX	XX	San Marcos	9965	San Marcos H S		, x	x	Ĵž	VERMON	T 8124	Otter Valley U H S	- 1	1	(I	x
		9158 9647	Westbury HS :		X	١ž	XX	Sanger	8250	Sanger H S		¥		X	Burington Casteron	8609 4314	Burington H S	x	x	ž	÷,
Hughes	Spos	P545	Humman Hargrave H S Hughes Springs H S Sam biouston St Univ		Ŷ,	, Iŝ	Î	Seagraves ;	8632 6477	Seagraves H S	27 9 .	X	x	x	Montpelier	6401	Nortbelier H S Feoples Academy	x		.	Ľ
Hurst (<u></u>	8325 6866	L D Bed H S		ÎX,	1ŝ.		Semencia' : *	- 641	Texas Lutheran Coll - Seminole H.S		ľ	X	X	Sant Johnsbury Sonngfield	8444	Springfield H S	<u></u>	x		_
JACUCY	nville -	4108	Jacksonwile Coll	2 ig	X	x	xx	Seymour Stumrock	8572	Shamrock H S		× ľ	X	x	VIRGINIA	9259	West Potomac H S	The	1x	x I	ž
Jasper Jayron		7043 8535	Jasoer HS Jayton HS	•	X,		X X	Sierra Blanca Snycer	4172	Western Texas Coll		Ŷ	Ŷ	x l	Big Stone Gap Burke	4376	Mournay Empire C C	X	XX		X
Jourdan Katy	ton	8748 8993	Jourdanton H S J E Tawor H S			X	Ľ.	Spearman	8575	Spearman H S		×			Charlottesville Chatharts	8615 9561	Charlotteswie H S Chatham Hail	-	X	X	X
Kaufma	a	9651	Katry H S Kautman H S	94 - 2 10	(,) '	1	Ç	Stephensle	8520 4204	Stationenville H S	.	×	X	xx	Christchurch ·	6616 6251	Harorave Mittaly Academy Christoniuron School	-	X	×	Ŷ,
Kernet		8557	Kerric HS		Î	ζ X	Î.	Stratford . Sugariand	6724 9319	Strationd H S Clements H S	1	x		X	Fork Union Kampton	6431	Hampton H S	x	1		Ŷ
KADDA	• • •	4112	Kioore Coll Central Texas Coll		X		XX	Survay	6128 9768	Kempner H S Sunnay H S		x	Ľ	ľ	Kamsonburg	9451	Harmsonburg H S	X	x		1
Kengawi	io.	6840 4212	H M King H S Taxas A & I Univ		x 3	ξĮ	xx	Sweetwater	9943 9943	Sweetwater H S		Ţ	Ç	ΧĮ,	Lyncrourg	4354 6467	Central Virginia Comm Coll Lynchouro Crinistian Academy	, ×	x	×	x
Krowo Krowa	od ♦	4260	Kingwood Coll NHMCCD Kirowne H S		X	۲X.	XX	Texanxana	4194	Texarkans Comm Coll Cos of the Manland		XX	1X	XX	Manassas Mar Meadows	6817 9867	Oscourn Parx & S Fort Chiswell HS	X	-	×	1
La Port	e kason	9359 4067 7040	La Porte H S Brazosport Coll		X.		X	Tyler	4228	Tyler Jr Coll Southwest Texas Jr Co		XX	XX	XXX	Rosnoka	8624 4351	Thomas Jetterson H S VA Western Convin Coll	X	XX	X	X
Lancast	w	8837	Lancaster Eisle Robertson Austro H S	n K S	Ŷ,	Ì¥.	X ,	Van hom	- 9155 9824	Van Horn HS	181	XX	x		Virona Beach Winchester	4398	Shenandoan Unw	· ^	x	^	ŷ
Lancia	, ·.	6464 8833	United H S LearNer H S	•	X,	ĮΫ.	x x	Victoria Waco	4062	Victoria Coll Baylor Univ		XXX	X	XXX	VIRGINIA Non-S	arturday 8621	Test Cemers* Shenandoah Valley Acad		12		10
Levelar Loony	w (4169 8577	South Plans Coll Liberty H S	• :	X,		XX		4131 9814	Michael Commic Coll Michael H S		Ŷ	1\$	ŝŝ	WASHING	TON		1.	1	1	
Loopeliei Launo		8559 8547	Laberheid H S Labore H S	•••	x	X	L x	Waxahachie	4182	S W Assemb of God C Westberlord Col	at i	XX	1 X	χ X	Abergeen	8857 4451	Admin H S Graen Buer Comm Coll	Ţ	x	x	Ŷ
Longvie	, 	4120	Lockiev H S La Tourneau Univ		X :	ç x	x x	Versiaco Waynon	858C 4252	Weslaco H S Whatton County & Col		XX	X	XX	Batte Ground	7187	Columbia Adventist Academy Forest Fuque Sch	x	x	ö	
Lubbod	k []	4123	Eucoock Christen Univ			č x	xx	Whee Setterner Whitesborp	# 6556 6141	Brewer HS Whitesboro HS	1.0	xľ		XXX	Belingham	9173 4490	Sammamish HS Western Washington Link	XX	XX	XX	X
Linin		4220 4051	Texas Tech Univ Angeina Col		X	ĨX	XX	Wichita Falls Wills Point	6825	Wits Point HS		Ĵ,	X	Ť,	Bornell Bremercon	6323 4466	Normshore School District Drympic Coll		x	X	X
Mansie Marbie I	rd Faits	8965 6717	Mansheld H S Marbie Falls H S			' x	l ľ	Water .	8C29	Wittens HS		Î,		۲ x	Cathlamei	6346	Watkakum HS	, Î,	Ŷ	^	X
Marshel Marshel	i 1.	4065	Hann KS East Texas Baptist Univ ~		lŷ ,	c x	ŷ x	TEXAS Non-Se	turday '	Test Centers*					Cohece Place	7049	Water Water Valley Academy Crewe H S	ô	Îx		ô
MCAIN!		5352	TX St Tech Inst Ext McAlle	en Or	x,	۲,	x x	Delas	7511	Azaba Academy of Dall	La C	24	6	"	Deer Park East Wegatchee	6362 6177	Deer Park H S Eastmort H S	· · X			X
MCKINI	7	4046 9818	Colin County Comm Coll.		x	X	XX	San Antonio	856;	Jewish Comm Center Value Grante Academ		24 12		10	Eastsound Eliensburg	8266 4444	Drcas Island H S Central Washington Univ	Ŷ		2 X	ļ
hissoul Mesia	.	9114 9077	MALLE IS	1	X ;;		X X	UTAH	· .		<u></u>			<u> </u>	Everen: Goloendele	8746 9397	Intanner H S Goldendale H S	X	Ľ	, X	X
Mand	an .	4127	Motion Coll Motion H S	· • . ·	X		X X	American Fork Bicknet Lings	7652	American Fork HS Wayne HS		XX	X	XX	Lookz	6364	Loost H 5	ę	Î.	^	•
Mission	1.13	8561	Minimum HS Mission HS	÷	X,	(Ř	x,	Banong - 7 Bountha	- 9017 - 8635	San Juan H 5 Boundlui H S		3 3	1 Š	žž	Dek Harbor	8900 9926	Cer Harbor HS Cantal HS	Ŷ	Î	X	x
Monuta Monuta	Va .	8562	Monahars H S Arriez Instreas: Texas Crimin C	M	Ê,		Â	Brigham City"	583	Box Eder HS		ŶŶ	1ĝ	ŝľ	Oroville Pasco	6494 4452	Orovile HS Countrie Basin Coll	X	x	x	x
hacono	oches ston	4188	Sternen F Austin St Univ New Bolton H S	·,	x i	i x	XX	Cecer City	471	Southern Uran Univ		X X	X	χ.	Fort Angeles Pulmen	4472 445	Hummsule Coll In astrongton St Univ	X	X	x	
New Bri Doessa		9093 4138	New Brauntets H S		x ,	(x	X x	Dena Duchesne	8556 9164	Dena HS Duchesne HS		XX	X	ž	Puysiup Cuncy	6647 8638	Noters HS	X	X		x
Ozona Paveson	4	8563 8550	Ozons H S Paessane H S		,	XX	x	Dugway Enterprise :	8587 8581	Dugway H S Energrise H S		ŏ		õ.	Hoya! City	829 . 9626	Roval H S Suggestion of H S	· (.	, I	X
Paritos Parits	-	9196 4140	Partos H S Partos X Coll		x ,	(X	xx	Ephram Garland	4273	Snow Coll Sear River H S	•	XXX	×	χX	Security	4484 6784	Univ of Washington Securit H.S.	Ŷ	Ŷ	Ŷ	Ŷ
Patricio		4157	rasiona n'S Sen Jaonto Got Cent Can Rovel H S		ΙŶ,	Ŷ	XX	Kanab	588 6209	Nanab H S Dans H S Leater H S		χĮ.	X	Ŷ	Sherran	6722 6346	Sherron H S Liberty H S	X			
Puantan	6	9201 7427	Peartand H S Peartail H S		X.	Î	Î	Logan	6622	Lonan H S Unan St Univ		<u>X</u>		XXX	Surryside	6157 8824	West Valley H S Surveysible Christian H S	X	X	X	x
Perrvtor		6738	Pertyon H S	·	1 1	40	x ^	Michaie .~	8589	Hidorest H S	···· ·:]	XX	X	X	1.	5781	Sunnyside H S	1.	X	Š	

2 i

.

195

X = Test Center is open for that test date. O = See your counselor for the test date.

 $\{\phi_i,\phi_i,\phi_j\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$

			· .	1933	<u>16</u>	z ž	8				1933	Š.	<u>s</u> §	8				192	55	8	<u>s</u>	
			1	12	=	-	=		6 -4-	Yest Camer	8	=	10	E	City	Code	Test Centar	12	5	n le		
,	. City	Code	Test Contor	18	1.X	2 3	15	 		2001 Comm	8	3	19	13	~~~			18	81	214	13	
	Washington	, con	L	1				Da Pere	65.57	De Pore It S St homet Col	X	r	x	1x	Pr Du Sac	8695 8777	Sauk Pravie H S Pulaski H S	X		ł	X	ŀ
	Twisp Vancouver	6102	Loerty Bek H S Clark Col	X	x	x	1	Delafield	8571	St John's Millary Academy	X	Ĵ	÷	1	Racine	6353	Jerome I Case Sr H S	1 x	.	1	X	
		9508	Everoreen HS	X	X	↓ ×	1.	East Troy Eau Clare	8658 £351	East Troy H S Memorial H S	Ŷ	^	- I ŝ	X		\$604	Washington Park H S	ÎŶ	[]		1	
	Wenatonee	8700	Wenatchee H S	ŝ		ÂL.	1Ŷ.		6349	North H S	X	x	xx	X	Receisburg	8907 8915	Webb H S Reedswite H S	x	1.1	В	: Ix	1.
	White Swan	4482 9473	Wenuichee Valley Colt		1×	õ ľ		Fond Du Lac	8652	Lower P Googrich H S	ŝ	X	XX	18	Rovelander	4645	Nociet Area Tech Coll	1¥	X	x.)>	i X	l `
	Yakana	4456	Yakima Valley Coll		X	X	X		4606	Warian Coll Fond Du Lad	Ŷ	^	· X	ÎŶ	Richland Center	4634	U of WLCv Richard 6 2 1	Ŷ	x	xþ	: Î	•
	WASHINGTON N	ion-Sat acto	arday Test Centers*		1.2	11	1	Fort Alkinson	6663	Fort Abunson H S		x		r	Bron Falls	4678	Ripon H S U of Wi River Falls	X	x	xB	X	
	Pasco	6155	Country Haven Academy .		12		1	Galesville	5892	Gale Ettrick Trempaalaau H S	131		JX	18	Shawano	8701	Shawano H S	X	X	χİ.	X	
	Spangle Wenatchee	8839 8830	Cascade Christian Academy	24	11	10		Germaniown	9620 8903	Germantown H S Nicolet H S	Ŷ	Ŷ,	^	1Ŷ	Sheboygan Falls	9641	Sheboygan Fails H S	L,		î١:) Ŷ	}
	WEST VIE	GIN	IA .					Green Bay	9152	Ashwaubenon H.S	Y.	¥ I	x x	Ĭž	So Milwaukee	8703 8704	So Mowaukee Sr H S - Soanta Sr H S	X	1X	B	x	
	Athens	4515	Concord Coll	13	131	X X	X		8666	West HS	ŝ	x	X	15	Stevens Point	4630	U of V/I Surveys Point	X	١¥ ا	×l3	, X	
	Bluefield	4514	Buetield St Coll	- Î Â	1¢	λ x	1x	Greendale	8669	Greenwood H S	Ŷ		×	1^	Sun Praine	9861	Sun Prairie H S	x	8	.1		
	Buckhannon *	4544 7377	W VA Wesleyan Coll Miniselman H S	X	X	XX	1x	Hantland -	8570	Arrowie H S South	X	X	XXX	X	Superior	468Z 8519	U of Wi Superior Hamilton H S	x	1	χĽ	: Q	
	Charleston "	6232	Capital H S	15	1X	X X	1.	Janesville	8672	Cra o H S	X	X	XX	1Ş	Tomah Turta Laka	8600	Tomah Sr H S		i v I	x h	, X	
	Circiente 1	9830	Crowvie H S	Ŷ	121	<u>^</u>].^	łĉ,	Jefforson	4689 93(6	Jefferson H S			- Lî	1Ŷ	Viroqua	9567	Vircoua H S	1	11	1	X	1.,
	Clarksburg	6386 9509	Loenty H S Pocationitas Co H S	1×	1Ž	× ×	X	Kenosha	4571	Carmage Colt .	X	x	x	X	Waterlown	8709	Riverside Hiddle School	X	x	- b	: Î	
	Elization	6744	Wn County H S	15	1.	J Š		Kinberty	6641	Kimberly HS	X		۲, N	1¥	Waukesha	9819	Catholic Memoryal H S	X	x	хB	1X	
	Fairmont	+520	Farmont St Coll	î	1 X	2 2	X	La Crosse	4672	U of WI La Crosse	x	Ŷ	x x	1Ŷ	Waupaca 📜	8711	Waupaca H S	X	ΙX	1	X	
	Fayetteville	9290 1572	Fayettensie H.S	X	1 _x	x X	1x		4662	Viterbo Coll Western Wil Tech Coll	X	Ì		1x	Waupun Wausay	9453 46%	U of Wi Ctr Marathon Co	x	x	x)	, İĝ	
۱. j. i	Heligesville	6123	Hacqesville HS	18	× X	XX	X.	Ladysmith	8574	Excessment H S	x	x	J×	1.	Wauwelosa	6712	Wauwatosa West Sr H S	X	,	۲l		
	Hunton Hunton	9043	Hontington East H S	1 x	121	x	12	Lake Geneva	4521 8898	Badoer H S	x	x	^ x	1Ŷ.	West Bend	4559	U of WI Cor Washington County	Ŷ	X	2 S	18	· · · ·
ite i	Number of State	4526	Marshad Univ	Ĭ	X	XXX	X	1 alva 1464a 1 x**	8675	N W MARLEY & HEVEL ACADOMY	×		×.	l _x	Whitefish Bay	8398 8409	Dominican H S Whitefish Bay H S	1	1.1		1 x	1.1
2225	leeger .	\$434	woper H S	X		. 18		Lancaster	6803	Lancaster H S	X		Jš	1×	Whitehall	8705	Whitehad H S	X	١ X	ΧÌ		1.4
	Keyser	4525	Perior ac St Coll	1.X	x	ŠX	Î.	Madison	8677 6133	East H S James Medison Methorial Sr H S	X.	ŝ	X X	1Ŷ	Wattot	8957	Wanot Union H S	101	101	1	ΙŶ.	1
<u> </u>	Kingwood	6330	Presion HS	X	13	ų Į Ž	X	19 THE	6181	La Folette H S		¥	×	X	Wrsc Rapids	9478	Lincoln H S	1	*	· [*	11	1.1
197	Logan	4525	Southern W VA CC	18	X	818	18		9516	WestHS	Ŷ	ŝ	XX	X	Countral	8655	Wisconsin Academy	24		1	5 I	1
	Madison	4511	WYA Inst of Tech	, IX	Ι.	余승	1X	Manitowod	4585	Sover Lake COl	x	^	x	1£	Mawaukee	1729	Jewish Contra Center	24	Ļ	_11	느	1.2
	Moorsfield	8647	Moorefield H S	Ş		÷		Мапледе	4693	U of WI Ctr Marsnette	×	x	×Įž	X	WYOMING		and the state of the second second second second second second second second second second second second second	ιù,				
	New Martices 1	4545	W VA Northorn Comm Col	Î	1X	îΪŝ	Ŷ	Marshoed	6183	Marshfield Sr H S			^	X	Ahon Bacos	8715 9072	Star Valley H S Little Snake River Valley H S	ô	1^1	16	i .	
÷ * -	Oak Ha Pankersburg	4548	Dak Hit H S Onio Valley Coll	ľ	1.	X	x	Marville	4697 6575	U of Wi Harshbeid Wood : Marwite H S	X.	×	^ x	1÷.	Basin Euro General	9571	Riverside HS	ă	6			
		4542	W VA Univ at Parkersturg	X	X	ΧĮΫ	١Ş.	Hectord	8650	Mediord Sr H S	¥.	¥	Ş Ş	1¥	Buttalo	8718	Buttaio H S]]	Σ.	J la	:[_'	1 × -
	Philippi	4508	Alberson Broadous Coll	X		313	x	Manomonia	9242	Menomonie Sr H S	Ω.	Ŷ	8 8	18	Casper	4995 8721	Casper Goll Chevenne Central H S	1¢ [\$.	χß	: ^	
•	Promise Pour Pleasant	8648 8517	Previe HS Port Present HS	ŤX	X	Χİ.	x	Mequility Henrit	6271 6683	Homestead H S Mernit Sr H S	ι χ		. 1*	1Ŷ.	Cearmont	9226	Arvada Clearmont H S	0	₄			- L.
	Renwood .	9252	Renwcoe H S	٠X	1.1	ĬŽ	1 v	Milwaukee	7051	Bay Vew HS	1.1		1.	X	Cokeville	8722	Control H S	0	121) !	
	\$ Charlescon	6466	South Charleston H S	۱^	2	. 12	Ŷ		2585	John Marshall Sr H S	Ŷ	x	x	t.	Douglas Evension	8724 8725	Douglas H S Evansion H S	1X	121	χļ,		ł
	Shepherdszown -	4532	Shepherd Coll Namous Co H S	X	X	ΧİΧ	1X		4610	Marquette Univ	x	x	X X	1¥	Guene	8728	Campbell Co H S	X	١.	xl3	X	
÷.	Sution	6623	Braxton County H S	X	X	XX	X		8587	Puleski H S	X	Ş	X X	1.	Greybul	8730	Greyoul HS		^	b		ľ
	Van	6810	Van Jr Si Hj6	X	1.1				6332	South Dresson H S	Ŷ	Ŷ	8 8	1Ŷ	Hanna	8731 8733	Hanna Elk Mith H S Jackson Hole H S	X	x	xb	47	1
- 1	Weinch	4547	W VA Northern Comm Coll	X	1X1	XIX	1x		6356	St Joan Antida H S	X	Χ.	X X	ÎX	Kenneter	B734	Kemmerer H S	X	X	, P	(X	· ·
÷.	West Liberty	4534	Wrest Licenty St Col	٦X	X	Š.	1¥		4658	U c! Wi Mewaukee			Ĭ	X	Laramie	5006	Univ of Wyoming	X	<u>x</u>	ŝ	X	
4	Wheeling A	4546	Wheeling Jesuit Coll	x	1Ŷ	x x	îx		8690	Washington H S	1^1	x	- Î	X	Lusk	8738 8366	Congregetional Church	18	8	818	3H - I	· ·
	Waternson	4527	Sciation W VA Comm Coll	X	[X]	XXX	×	Minoraus	8705	Wisconsin Lutheran H S	X	×	×lž		Mountain Vaw	8740	Mountain View H S	0		19	<u>(</u>]	-
	Pennstorb	9193	Nounain St Academy	24		110		Monroe	8691	MONDE HS	ŝ	x	XX	1×	Pineciale	8743	Priedale H S	ŏ	ŏ	_{{}}		
	WISCONS	IN		·	k			New Berlen	8555	New Berlin Wast H S	Ŷ	x	1^	1Ŷ	Powell	5004 6744	Northwest Comm Coll Revenue H S	X	X	۲ľ	X	
	Ama Center	\$907	Lincon H S	Ξž	11	1	X	New Horstein	9217 8041	New Holstein H S	x			łž	Riverton	4900	Central Wyoming Col	ž	¥.	, l?	Į X	
	Απική Απικόρ	276	Amery H S Avaoo Sr H S	1	x	1 X		Oconomowac	9402	Oconomowor H S	X	×	×	1.	Saratoga	8749	Saratoga H S	ô		<u>_</u>]6	2127	
	Accention	8559	Accesson H S East	1Ş	13	XX	X	Octinio Falls	5621	Ormo H S	x i		X	1Ŷ	Shendan	50C2 8750	Shencan Coll Sungance H S	16	IX.	* P	5[*]	
· .	Boisen Lake	8684	Univitis	Î	$ ^{} $) î		Oneiasida	9975 8352	Dnelaska H S Oracion H S	ľ	X	×	X	Thermopolis	8751	Hot Sannas Co H S	X	X	- 12		1
-	Baraboo : Beaver Dam	8651 6242	Baranco Sr H S Seaver Dam H S	1	1x	4	x	Oshkosh	4674	U of WI Dshkosh	X	x	XX	X	Wheatiand ~."	8752	Wheatund H S	X	X	þ	ił l	1.
	Balan	\$376	Waynerd Academy	÷	1,1	XX		Pewaukaé	4571	Heshood II 5 Weukesha County Tech Coli	x	x	xx	1Ŷ	Wonand	8753 8360	Worland H S Wright Jr Sr H S	1×	X	B	11	1
	Brockfield .	8506	Brootherd East H S	- î î	1^1	x]^	X	Philips	8695	Photos H S Ll of Wi Postenile	x	x	xIx	10					Ē	T		1.
	Brown Dear Bunnoopo	9453 9477	5rown Deer H 5 Carrolic Central H S	x		ŀ	X	Port Weshington	8667	Port Wastington H S	x	X	χĮΧ	X	END OF A	ст т	EST CENTERS	1. J	I, I	ĮΓ.	4	
-	Cecercury	6295	Cacarburg HS		1.1		Į	Portage Povnette	6594 8776	Portuge Terrer H S		^	1	X		+ T '		÷.,	20		<u>.</u> !	
	Cudary	8656	Cucany H S	13	ĻχΙ	12	12	Pr Du Crien	8596	Prane Du Chen Sr H \$	I X I	X,	. IX	1		$f_{i,j}$ s	يغ ويسيب ما م			÷.,	- 1	
		e :					a ()	لمقافسة موجد		and the second second	·	•	•••		1 222-23	21		1		ti. Kor		
	Test Da	v C	hecklist	÷					- - -	Tall 🖬 🖬 At the	Te	es	t C	en	ter	-	المجار المراجع		7			
							- 1	a ana ing ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang a	. A 12				1.7		10		فبمدهد والمحاد والمحاد والا				· • • •	

📕 Test Day Checklist 🐇 a and a set of a

.

•

Test Day CheckIISt Report to your assigned test center by 6:00 AM. Take the following items with you: □ Your test center admission ticket. If you registered late or changed test centers, your ticket will be a Western Union priority letter or maligram.

ACCEPTABLE IDENTIFICATION. Your admission ticket is not identification. See details on page 32.

Three sharpened soft-lead (No. 2) pencils with erasers. Hi-lite pens are not allowed.

A watch, it you wish to pace yourself. Test centers are not required to provide wall clocks. The supervisor will announce when 5 minutes remain on each test. Do NOT bring a calculator watch; you will be required to remove it from sight during testing.

.

!

ς.•

At the rest borner will admit you to the test center, direct you to a seat, and provide test materials. 7. - N. - A

Testing begins only after all examinees present at 8:00 AM are checked in. A break is scheduled after the first two tests. You will be dismissed at about 12:15.

You CANNOT take textbooks, foreign language or other dictionaries, notes, calculators, or any device with calculating functions or other aids into the examination room.

 If you become III or do not complete the test for any reason, tell your test supervisor or proctor—before you leave the test center—whether or not your answer sheet should be scored. and a start

٦

-

٠.

. .

. 🖓 :

÷.,•.

• . .

24

÷

· · ·

÷.

APPENDIX C

SAT EXAMINATION SITES

College Board Regional Offices



Middle States: Suite 410, 3440 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104-3338. (215) 387-7600
Midwest: Suite 401, 1800 Sherman Avenue, Evanston, IL 60201-3715. (708) 866-1700
New England: 470 Totten Pond Road, Waltham, MA 02154-1982. (617) 890-9150
South: Suite 250, 2970 Clairmont Road, Atlanta, GA 30329-1639. (404) 636-9465
Southwest: Suite 400, 701 Brazos Street, Austin, TX 78701-3253. (512) 472-0231
West: Suite 480, 2099 Gateway Place, San Jose, CA 95110-1017. (408) 452-1400
Suite 900, 4155 East Jewell Avenue, Denver, CO 80222-4510. (303) 759-1800

In Puerto Rico, inquiries should be directed to:

The College Board, Suite 701, Banco Popular, Hato Rey, Puerto Rico 00918. (809) 759-8625 Mailing Address: P.O. Box 71101, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00936-7001

In Alaska and Hawaii: inquiries should be directed to the Western office at the California address.

11016-00942 • WW73M90 • 200679 • Printed in U.S.A.

APPENDIX D

SURVEY OF RECRUITMENT, ADMISSION & SELECTION CRITERIA FOR RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS

	OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY Department of Educational Administration and Higher Education Stillwater, OK 74078					
	Survey of Recruitment, Admission and Selection Criteria for Radiologic Technology Programs					
	Instructions: The items in this questionnaire have been arranged in two parts. Part I: Opinion Rating (for each item <u>circle one</u> response) and Part II: General Information.					
4	Strongly Agree					
3 -	Agree				٦	
1 -	Strongly Disagree			7		l
0-	No Opinion	1	Ţ	Ţ	Ţ	
Pa	rt 1: Admission Criteria Rating	Y	Ŧ	T	Y	Y
1.	In your opinion, there is a correlation between a student's pre-admission ACT Composite Score and the student's score on the post-graduate certification examination sponsored by the A.R.R.T.	0	1	2	3	4
2.	In your opinion, there is a correlation between a student's pre-admission individual section scores on the ACT and the ARRT examination.	0	1	2	3	4
3.	In your opinion, there is a significant relationship between grades in high school science subject and radiography curriculum counterparts.	0	1	2	3	4
4.	In your opinion, high school grade point averages (HSGPA), algebra grades and biology grades should be used in the selection of students for radiologic technology programs.	0	1	2	3	4
5.	In your opinion, HSGPA or grades in algebra or biology can be used to predict passing of the ARRT examination.	0	1	2	3	4
6.	In your opinion, the ACT is a valid predictor of college grades for students from low socioeconomic backgrounds.	0	1	2	3	4
7.	In your opinion. ACT assessment should be used to decide a students' admission into a radiologic technology program.	0	1	2	3	4
8.	In your opinion, ACT results should be used to reject radiologic technology student applicants.	Q	1	2	3	4
9.	In your opinion, ACT scores or SAT scores and high school rank should be used as admission criteria.	0	1	2	3 .	4
10.	In your opinion, a student's ACT scores combined with either HSGPA or high school ranking are highly predictive of radiologic technology program success.	0	1	2	3	4
11.	In your opinion, ACT results are useful in counseling and guiding students.	U	1	2	3	4

4	Strongly Agree	ب غيب 2 غير				
3	Agree				-	
2	Disagree					
	Strongly Disagree		-			
0	No Opinion	7			ł	
		¥	۲	*	Ý	Ý
12	In your opinion, the use of GPA as the only admission criteria limits admissions to only academic achievers and excludes others with less academic ability.	0	1	2	3	4
13	In your opinion, using the prediction of GPA as the only admission criteria excludes students with less academic ability but possibly greater skills in leadership.	0	1	2	3	4
14	In your opinion, predictors of student success must be chosen which are appropriate to the goals of the radiologic technology program.	0	1	2	3	4
15	In your opinion, HSGPA combined with aptitude tests are more effective predictors of college grades than either one alone.	0	1	2	3	4
16	In your opinion, should standardized admission's criteria be ranked or weighted, so that students with the highest accumulated score be admitted to radiologic technology programs.	0	1	2	3	4
17	In your opinion, are current radiologic technology programs, courses, policies and procedures appropriate for adult learners.	0	1	2	3	4
18	In your opinion, should students, facts and impressions obtained by the interviewer be correlated to the academic/clinical situations, to predict a students success in radiologic technology.	0	1	2	3	4
19	In your opinion, information obtained in a student interview enables the interviewer to assess an applicant's vocabulary and ability to be concise and explicit in conveying thoughts.	0	1	2	3	4
20.	In your opinion, traditional admissions criteria, previous academic performance and aptitude tests, have excluded large numbers of individuals, many of whom had the motivation and the personality characteristics necessary to succeed.	0	1	2	3	4
21.	In your opinion, there is a relationship between age, length of experience in an allied health setting prior to entry into a radiologic technology program, and academic success.	0	1	2	3	4
22.	In your opinion, cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains of students should be weighted and used in selecting radiologic technology students.	0	1	2	3	4
23.	In your opinion, the goals and objectives of the radiologic technology program and the sponsoring institution should be related to cultivation of accepted applicant competencies so that an effective entry-level radiographer is a product of the two.	0	1	2	3	4
24.	In your opinion, valid and reliable behavior measurements should be used in the admissions process to radiologic technology programs.	0	1	2	3	4
25	In your opinion, an array of relevant criteria should be used to assure applicant equity.	0	1	2	3	4
26.	In your opinion, a legal review of selection policies dealing with uniformity, as well as exceptions to such uniformity should be done every three years.	0	1	2	3	4
27	In your opinion, a radiologic technology program should use the same admissions process for all applicants.	0	1	2	3	4

** * . .

4	- Strongly Agree				. "	
3	- Agree				7	
2	- Disagree			٦		
0	- No Opinion		7			
		ł	¥	¥	¥	Ŧ
2	 In your opinion, applicants should be provided an opportunity to show that certain criteria may be inappropriate for evaluating their qualifications. 	()	1	2	3	4
2	In your opinion, considerable flexibility might have to be incorporated into radiologic technology student selection to attract individuals from under-represented groups in the applicant pool.	0	1	2	3	4
30	 In your opinion, a program should describe its admissions criteria publicly so that potential applicants can obtain a reasonable estimate of their likelihood of meeting such standards. 	0	1	2	3	4
3	In your opinion, rejected applicants should be given a statement of reasons for their rejection and a means of appeal if they want to challenge the explanation.	0	I	2	3	4
32	In your opinion, all those who participate in student selection should be instructed and competent in the process of multiple domain evaluation of radiologic technology applicants.	0	1	2	3	4
3	In your opinion, an internal audit should be done in the form of selection evaluation as well as external screening of the selection policies and procedures to assure consumers and governmental funding agencies that the admission process has been actually implemented according to stated protocols should be done each year.	0	I	2	3	4
34	In your opinion, foresight is critical in the student selection process if radiologic technology programs are to survive the challenge of declining numbers of college-age applicants in the 1990's.	0	1.	2	3	4
35	In your opinion, research is essential to determine the relative importance of inappropriate selection processes.	0	1	2	3	4
36	In your opinion, program directors must couple effective recruitment strategies with rationale, humane and equitable selection policies.	0	1	2	3	4
37	In your opinion, information networks should be established to permit exchange of recruitment and selection in radiologic technology education.	0	1	2	3	4
38	In your opinion, radiologic technology programs should deemphasize technical and scientific training in favor of emphasis on the social sciences, the humanities, and training in thinking or problem solving skills.	0	I	2	3	4
39	In your opinion, radiologic technology programs should give more emphasis on training in scholastic skills such as writing and critical thinking as well as afford opportunities for the development of suitable values.	0	1	2	3	4
40	In your opinion, the current focus on scientific knowledge in radiologic technology admissions decisions should be modified to allow for more emphasis in students' abilities to learn independently and acquire analytic skills and values appropriate to the field of radiologic technology.	0	1	2	3	4 .

	What weighted instruments are used as part of your selection criteria? (check all that apply)
	ACT Health Occupations Basic Entrance Test
	SAT PSB-Health Occupations Aptitude Examination
	Other
	What criteria are used in your selection process of radiologic technology students? (please list)
	A E
	B F
	C G
	D H
	Please attach a copy of your guidelines and forms used in your selection process.
	Gender of respondent: Male Female
	What is your job classification? Program Director Faculty Other
	How many people serve on your selection committee?
	How many years have you served on student selection committees?
	What is your highest level of education? Associate Degree Masters Degree Bachelors Degree Specialist Degree
• • •	What is the average age of applicants?MaleFemale
	By percentages, what is the gender composition of your applicants?MaleFemale
• •	What is your programs first time percentage pass rate for the ARRT Examination?
•	The location of your school may be described as: (check one) major metropolitan area (1,000,000 or more)town or medium city (10,000 to 99,000) large city or metropolitan area (100,000 to 1,000,000)small town or rural center (fewer than 10,000

		n da post					
	·····						
		Th:	ank you for a	nswering th	is survey!		
		All of y	our answers v	will remain	confidential.	-	
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>			·	
f you are i	nterested in obtainin	g a conv of th	ne results of t	his survey.	please provide th	ne following infor	mation.
Na	mc:				p		
Tit	lc/Department:						
Ins	titution:			•			
Ad	dress:						
Cit	y, State, Zip				-		
						·	
						· .	
· · · · ·		e di sere	.*		÷		
	· · · · ·						
						· .	
	ч.				• •		

Namo		
Name:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Lollege:		
Address:		~.
	State:	21p:
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS H	REQUEST FORM:	
Name:		
College:		
Address:		
City:	State:	Zip:
		
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS F	REQUEST FORM:	
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS F	REQUEST FORM:	
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS F	REQUEST FORM:	
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS F Name: College: Address: City:	REQUEST FORM:	Zip:
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS F Name: College: Address: City:	REQUEST FORM:	Zip:
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS F	EQUEST FORM:	Zip:
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS H	REQUEST FORM:	Zip:
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS H	REQUEST FORM:	Zip:
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS H Name: College: Address: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS H Name: College:	REQUEST FORM:	Zip:
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS H Name: College: Address: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS H Name: College: Address:	REQUEST FORM:	Zip:
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS H	REQUEST FORM:	Zip:

APPENDIX E

INTRODUCTORY LETTER

•

April, 1991

Dear Colleague:

I am preparing a dissertation titled <u>A National Study of Selection Criteria for Students in</u> <u>Community College Radiologic Technology Programs</u> in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Ed.D. in Educational Administration and Higher Education at Oklahoma State University. I respectfully ask for your assistance in filling out the enclosed questionnaire. Through the questionnaire, I hope to determine which criteria are used in the selection of students for radiologic technology programs throughout the United States. The attached questionnaire is also designed to identify what instruments are used in selection processes.

I sincerely hope you will provide me with 20-30 minutes of your time to complete and return the questionnaire in the enclosed, self-addressed envelope. To insure confidentiality of individual programs, a coding system is employed. At the completion of data analysis, information linking programs to specific research instruments will be discarded.

The results of the research will be reported in the dissertation. If you are interested in receiving a summary of the findings, please complete the enclosed form, <u>Summary of Findings Request Form</u>, and mail it along with your completed questionnaire.

Thank you for your consideration, time and attention.

Sincerely,

Paul William Bober, Ed.S., RT(R) Director of Radiography

as

Enclosures

APPENDIX F

FOLLOW-UP LETTER
July, 1991

Dear Colleague:

I am preparing a dissertation titled <u>A National Study of Selection Criteria for Students in</u> <u>Community College Radiologic Technology Programs</u> in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Ed.D. in Educational Administration and Higher Education at Oklahoma State University. I respectfully ask for your assistance in filling out the enclosed questionnaire. Through the questionnaire, I hope to determine which criteria are used in the selection of students for radiologic technology programs throughout the United States. The attached questionnaire is also designed to identify what instruments are used in selection processes.

209

I sincerely hope you will provide me with 20-30 minutes of your time to complete and return the questionnaire in the enclosed, self-addressed envelope. To insure confidentiality of individual programs, a coding system is employed. At the completion of data analysis, information linking programs to specific research instruments will be discarded.

The results of the research will be reported in the dissertation. If you are interested in receiving a summary of the findings, please complete the enclosed form, <u>Summary of Findings Request Form</u>, and mail it along with your completed questionnaire.

Please return by July 11, 1991.

Thank you for your consideration, time and attention.

\$incerely,

Paul William Bober, Ed.S., RT(R) Director of Radiography

as

Enclosures

APPENDIX G

LIST OF ACRONYMS

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ACT - American College Test AHAT - Allied Health Aptitude Test AHQT - Allied Health Qualifying Test APST - Scores APT - Aptitude Test Score ASSET - Math & English Assessments CAT - College Aptitude Test/Assessment CBAP - College Board Assessment and Test Placement CBP - College Board Placement CGP - College Guidance and Placement CGPE - Counseling Guidance and Placement Exam CPE - College Placement Exam CPT - Computerized Placement Test ENGL - Command of English Language EVAL - Evaluations GPA - Grade Point Average HGPA - Highest Grade Point Average HOBET - Health Occupations Basic Entrance Test IAE - Institutional Assessment Exam INIV - Interview MAPS - Basic Skills Exam MATH - Mathematics NJBS - New Jersey Basic Skills Tests OPEN - Open Door OWN - Use of own weighted instrument or assessment test(s) PSB - Psychological Services Bureau SAT - Scholastic Aptitude Test SCHL - Scholastics SPT - School Placement Tests TABI - Vocational Test Measuring Math, Reading and Language TASP - Texas Academic Skills Exam A & P - Anatomy & Physiology ACAD - Academic Achievement ACT - American College Test ACTC - American College Test Composite ACTM - American College Test Mathematics ACTR - American College Test Reading AMAT - American Medical Aptitude Test ALGB - Foundations of Algebra, Intermediate or College APDT - Aptitude Test APPL - Date of Completed Application APST - Aptitude Stanine APT - Aptitude

211

ASSET - Reading, Writing and Math BIOLOGY - Biology Prerequisite CGP - College Guidance and Placement CGP - College Guidance and Flacement CGPA - College Placement and Guidance A-1 CGPC - College Guidance and Placement C-1 CGPR - Comparative Guidance and Placement Reading CGPV - Comparative Guidance and Placement Verbal CHEM - Chemistry CHGP - College Highest Grade Point COLLEGE - Amount of college level courses completed COMP - Computers CPC - Completed Prerequisite Courses CPT - College Placement Test CPT - Computerized Placement Test CRED - Credentials DEGREE - Educational Degree DMD -DOMI - Domicile ENGL - English EXPR - Medical Experience FILE - File Completed GED - General Education Development GEOM - Geometry GNED - General Education GOAL - Career Goal Statement GPA - Grade Point Average GPC - Grade Point Composite HGPA - Highest Grade Point Average HLEX -HS - High School HSA - High School Average HSB - High School Biology HSC - High School Courses HSMT - High School Math Test HSRANK - High School Class Rank INTV - Interview/Observation in Radiology Department MAPS - Basic Skills Exam MATH - Math Prof Test MDTM -NIBS - New Jersey Basic Skills Test ORNT - Pre-admission Orientation PBK - Professional Background Knowledge PHC - Basic Physics PHYS - Physical Exam Completed PREQ - Pertinent Courses Completed PROF - Proficiency Test PSB - Psychological Services Bureau PTCR - Patient Care Experience QWE - Quality of Written Essay READ - Freshman Reading RECM - Recommendation(s) REFR - References REME - Remedial Courses RESD - Residency SAT - Scholastic Aptitude Test

SCNC - Successful Completion of Necessary Courses SCNS - Successful Completion of Necessary Sciences SKET -

SKILL - Texas Academic Skills Exam VIST - Hospital Visitation

WKEXP - Previous Health Care Work Experience WQR - Written Question Response

WRITING - Written Communication

APPENDIX H

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Descriptive statistical analysis utilizing the equation:

 $Y = B_0 + B_1 X_1 + e_1$, should be used

When N sets of values for X_i are given, the constants B_0 and B_i must be determined in such a way to keep e_i , regression disturbance, at a minimum value. The dependent variable Y_1 will be the predicted value for the terminal profile a limited time before and after specified education has taken place. Y_2 will be the predicted registry score as outlined below.

The independent variable include:

X1: HOBET composite

X₂: HSGPA

X₃: College GPA

X₄: HOBET Social Interaction Profile

X₅: Core GPA (Radiography Course)

X₆: Terminal Profile Score

The regression analysis will involve the identification of the appropriate regression constants and coefficients for the following equations:

$$Y_{1} = B_{0} + B_{1}X_{1} + B_{2}X_{2}$$

$$Y_{1} = B_{0} + B_{2}X_{2} + B_{3}X_{3} + B_{4}X_{4}$$

$$Y_{2} = B_{0} + B_{1}X_{1} + B_{2}X_{2} + B_{3}X_{3} + B_{5}X_{5} + B_{6}X_{6}$$

APPENDIX I

WEIGHTING MECHANISM FOR RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY

APPLICANT DATA

WEIGHTING MECHANISM FOR RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY APPLICANT DATA

A. BEHAVIOR	AL DOMAINS	
DOMAIN	INFORMATION SOURCE	VALUES ASSIGNMENT
COGNITIVE	Overall High School GPA (General Academic Potential)	<1.5 reject 1.6 - 2.0 = 1 point 2.1 - 2.5 = 2 points 2.6 - 3.0 = 3 points 3.1 - 3.5 = 4 points 3.6 - 4.0 = 5 points
	GED Score (General Education Development)	40 = reject 41 - 45 D = 1 point 46 - 50 C = 2 points 51 - 55 B = 3 points 56 - 60 A = 4 points
	Overall College GPA	<1.5 reject 1.6 - 2.0 = 1 point 2.1 - 2.5 = 2 points 2.6 - 3.0 = 3 points 3.1 - 3.5 = 4 points 3.6 - 4.0 = 5 points
	Science High School GPA (Specific Academic Potential)	<pre><2.0 reject 2.1 - 2.5 = 1 point 2.6 - 3.0 = 2 points 3.1 - 3.5 = 3 points 3.6 - 4.0 = 4 points</pre>
	Science College GPA	<pre><2.0 reject 2.1 - 2.5 = 1 point 2.6 - 3.0 = 2 points 3.1 - 3.5 = 3 points 3.6 - 4.0 = 4 points</pre>
an an tha tha tha tha ang tha Tha	SAT Combined Score (Standardized Achievement)	<701 reject 701 - 800 = 1 point 801 - 900 = 2 points 901 -1000 = 3 points 1001+ = 4 points
	ACT Composite Score	<10 reject 11 - 15 = 1 point 16 - 20 = 2 points 21 - 25 = 3 points 26+ = 4 points

217

APPLICANT DATA (cont'd)

DOMAIN	INFORMATION SOURCE	VALUES ASSIGNMENT
AFFECTIVE	Formal Interview (integrity, motivation, empathy)	100 reject 101 - 150 = 1 point 151 - 200 = 2 points 201 - 250 = 3 points 251 - 300 = 4 points
	Letter of Recommendations (good leadership, perseverance)	<pre><34 reject 35 - 69 = 1 point 70 - 104 = 2 points 105 - 140 = 3 points</pre>
	Clinical Interview (poise, personality)	28 reject 29 - 39 = 1 point 40 - 50 = 2 points
	Essay (written communication skills, motivational)	Poor = reject Acceptable = 1 point Exceptional = 2 points
PSYCHOMOIOR	Outside Activities/Hobbies (physical activities involving gross motor skills and spatial perception)	1 hobby/sport = 1 point 2+ hobbies/sports = 2 point
PSYCHOMOIOR B. POINT AS	Outside Activities/Hobbies (physical activities involving gross motor skills and spatial perception) SIGNMENTS FOR DEMOGRAPHIC BIOGRAPHIC DAT	1 hobby/sport = 1 point 2+ hobbies/sports = 2 point A CLASSIFICATION
PSYCHOMOIOR B. POINT AS Applicant is Applicant ha	Outside Activities/Hobbies (physical activities involving gross motor skills and spatial perception) SIGNMENIS FOR DEMOGRAPHIC BIOGRAPHIC DAT ethnic minority - add 1 point. s worked in a health care setting - add	1 hobby/sport = 1 point 2+ hobbies/sports = 2 point A CLASSIFICATION 1 point.
PSYCHOMOIOR B. POINT AS Applicant is Applicant ha	Outside Activities/Hobbies (physical activities involving gross motor skills and spatial perception) SIGNMENTS FOR DEMOGRAPHIC BIOGRAPHIC DAT ethnic minority - add 1 point. s worked in a health care setting - add	1 hobby/sport = 1 point 2+ hobbies/sports = 2 poin A CLASSIFICATION 1 point.
PSYCHOMOIOR B. POINT AS Applicant is Applicant ha . COMMENT(S)	Outside Activities/Hobbies (physical activities involving gross motor skills and spatial perception) SIGNMENTS FOR DEMOGRAPHIC BIOGRAPHIC DAT ethnic minority - add 1 point. s worked in a health care setting - add	1 hobby/sport = 1 point 2+ hobbies/sports = 2 poin A CLASSIFICATION 1 point.
PSYCHOMOIOR B. POINT AS Applicant is Applicant ha . COMMENT(S)	Outside Activities/Hobbies (physical activities involving gross motor skills and spatial perception) SIGNMENTS FOR DEMOGRAPHIC BIOGRAPHIC DAT ethnic minority - add 1 point. s worked in a health care setting - add	1 hobby/sport = 1 point 2+ hobbies/sports = 2 poin A CLASSIFICATION 1 point.
PSYCHOMOIOR B. POINT AS Applicant is Applicant ha . COMMENT(S)	Outside Activities/Hobbies (physical activities involving gross motor skills and spatial perception) SIGNMENTS FOR DEMOGRAPHIC BIOGRAPHIC DAT ethnic minority - add 1 point. s worked in a health care setting - add	1 hobby/sport = 1 point 2+ hobbies/sports = 2 poin A CLASSIFICATION 1 point.
PSYCHOMOIOR B. POINT AS Applicant is Applicant ha	Outside Activities/Hobbies (physical activities involving gross motor skills and spatial perception) SIGNMENIS FOR DEMOGRAPHIC BIOGRAPHIC DAT ethnic minority - add 1 point. s worked in a health care setting - add	1 hobby/sport = 1 point 2+ hobbies/sports = 2 poin A CLASSIFICATION 1 point.
PSYCHOMOIOR B. FOINT AS Applicant is Applicant ha COMMENT(S)	Outside Activities/Hobbies (physical activities involving gross motor skills and spatial perception) SIGNMENIS FOR DEMOGRAPHIC BIOGRAPHIC DAT ethnic minority - add 1 point. s worked in a health care setting - add	1 hobby/sport = 1 point 2+ hobbies/sports = 2 poin A CLASSIFICATION 1 point.
PSYCHOMOIOR B. POINT AS Applicant is Applicant ha COMMENT(S)	Outside Activities/Hobbies (physical activities involving gross motor skills and spatial perception) SIGNMENIS FOR DEMOGRAPHIC BIOGRAPHIC DAT ethnic minority - add 1 point. s worked in a health care setting - add	1 hobby/sport = 1 point 2+ hobbies/sports = 2 poin A CLASSIFICATION 1 point.

VITA Z

Paul William Bober

Candidate for the Degree of

Higher Education

Thesis: A STUDY OF COGNITIVE AND NON-COGNITIVE SELECTION CRITERIA FOR STUDENTS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS

Major Field: Higher Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, May 21, 1951, the son of Arnold W. and Aldine Ann Bober.

Education: Graduated from Bosco High School, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, in May 1965; received a Bachelor of Science Degree in Natural Science from Dominican College at Racine in May 1973; completed requirements for the Master of Science Degree at Pittsburg State University, Pittsburg, Kansas in May 1984 and the Education Specialist Degree in July 1986.

Professional Experience: Faculty-Clinical Instructor, Radiologic Technology Program, Labette Community College, August 1982 to August 1989; Program Director, Radiologic Technology, Labette Community College, August 1989 to present.