


# Enrollment Snapshot 2024



© 2024 ASRT. All rights reserved.  
Reproduction in any form is forbidden without written permission from publisher.

## Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>4</b>
Sample .....	4
Demographics .....	4
Student Capacity .....	4
Near-term Changes .....	5
Student Attrition .....	5
Enrollment Analysis .....	5
<b>Demographics.....</b>	<b>6</b>
Indicate your program type. ....	6
What is your primary place of employment? .....	7
What is the terminal degree earned by the graduates in your program? .....	8
In what country is your program located? .....	9
If you chose the United States in the question above, please indicate in which region your program is located. ...	10
<b>Overall Program Frequency Statistics .....</b>	<b>11</b>
How viable is your program over the next few years? .....	11
Is your program currently at full enrollment? .....	12
Do you plan any changes related to enrollment? .....	13
<b>Longitudinal Enrollment Trends by Discipline .....</b>	<b>14</b>
Number of ARRT-approved programs by discipline: .....	14
Radiography .....	16
Estimated total number of students entering radiography programs: .....	17
Radiation Therapy.....	18
Estimated total number of students entering radiation therapy programs: .....	19
Nuclear Medicine Technology .....	20
Estimated total number of students entering nuclear medicine technology programs: .....	21
Sonography .....	22
Estimated total number of students entering sonography programs:.....	22
Magnetic Resonance Imaging.....	23
Estimated total number of students entering magnetic resonance imaging programs: .....	23
<b>Discipline Comparisons .....</b>	<b>24</b>
Number of students entering classroom .....	24
Additional students per program for those not at full capacity .....	25
How many qualified students did you turn away this fall? .....	26
Attrition Rate .....	27
How viable is your program over the next few years? .....	28
Is your program currently at full enrollment? .....	29
Do you plan any changes related to enrollment? .....	30
<b>Primary Place of Employment Comparisons .....</b>	<b>31</b>
Number of students entering classroom .....	31

Additional students per program for those not at full capacity .....32

How many qualified students did you turn away this fall? .....33

Attrition Rate .....34

How viable is your program over the next few years? .....35

Is your program currently at full enrollment? .....36

Do you plan any changes related to enrollment? .....37

**Additional Documents (please contact the ASRT for a copy):**

Survey Instruments and Invitation Letter

## Executive Summary

### Sample

In late September 2024, an invitation to complete an online questionnaire was sent via email to 1,263 radiography, radiation therapy, nuclear medicine technology, sonography and magnetic resonance imaging programs approved by the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists (ARRT). At the close of the survey in early November 2024, a total of 358 responses had been received, with reported enrollments for 412 disciplines, yielding an overall response rate of 32.6%.

Based upon the known population parameters listed below, the finite population correction factor was used when computing confidence intervals.

Discipline	Return	Population	Percent Sampled	Margin of Error at 95% Level
Radiography	286	750	38.1%	±4.6%
Radiation Therapy	40	100	40.0%	±12.1%
Nuclear Medicine Technology	22	93	23.7%	±18.4%
Sonography	34	252	13.5%	±15.7%
Magnetic Resonance Imaging	30	68	44.1%	±13.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>412</b>	<b>1,263</b>	<b>32.6%</b>	<b>±4.0%</b>

### Representation

A test of proportions for each discipline and Bonferroni post hoc tests indicated that the sample proportion for radiography and sonography were statistically different from the population proportion ( $\alpha = .0125$ ). Proportional weights derived from the population distribution were computed and comparisons were made between unweighted and weighted aggregated descriptive and frequency statistics. The differences were not statistically significant; therefore, unweighted statistics are presented in this report.

### Demographics

Most responses to the survey were from programs offering instruction in radiography (69.4%); 9.7% were from radiation therapy programs, 8.3% were from sonography programs; 7.3% from magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) programs, and 5.3% from programs offering instruction in nuclear medicine technology (NMT).

A plurality of respondents (48.0%) work at a community college; 25.4% work at a university, 15.1% at a medical center, 8.4% at a technical college, and 3.1% at a for-profit school.

The most common terminal degree offered by responding institutions is an associate degree (76.5%) and 23.5% offer a bachelor's degree.

The majority of programs surveyed (98.3%) are located in the United States; 1.4% are in Canada, 0.3% are in Australia.

Of the programs responding, 22.2% were in the South Atlantic region, with 16.5% from the East North Central region. The lowest response rates were from the Pacific region (5.7%) and New England (5.7%).

### Student Capacity

Asked whether their program is currently at full enrollment, 66.2% of responding programs said yes and 33.8% said no.

Programs not at full enrollment were asked how many additional students their program could accommodate. An estimated 5.5 additional students could be accommodated at radiography programs, 5.9 at radiation therapy programs, 7.3 at NMT programs,

1.0 at sonography programs, and 3.7 at MRI programs.

For programs not at full capacity, this produces an estimate of 1,425 additional spaces for students across all radiography programs, 270 additional spaces for students across all radiation therapy programs, 279 additional spaces for students across all NMT programs, 25 additional spaces for students across all sonography programs, and 166 additional spaces for students across all MRI programs.

The mean number of qualified students turned away by radiography programs was 46.2. Radiation therapy programs turned away an average of 18.5 qualified students, NMT programs turned away an average of 40.4 qualified students, sonography programs turned away an average of 49.0 qualified students and MRI programs turned away an average of 36.0 qualified students.

This produces an estimate of 22,780 qualified students turned away in radiography, 1,010 turned away by therapy programs, 2,211 turned away by nuclear medicine programs, 11,113 turned away by sonography programs and 815 turned away by MRI programs.

### Near-term Changes

Most of the programs surveyed plan to maintain their current levels of enrollment; 70.0% of programs across these disciplines plan to keep their enrollment at the same level; 27.7% of programs plan to increase enrollment, and the remaining 2.2% plan to decrease their enrollment.

The majority of programs across disciplines (87.4%) will definitely continue to operate; 12.1% will most likely continue operations, and only 2 (0.6%) will most likely close. No responding programs have a definite plan to close.

---

<sup>1</sup> Methodological Note: In previous years, no attempt was made to determine the plausibility of responses about attrition. In the last three years responses were recoded according to the following scheme: If the respondent indicated an attrition rate of 59% or lower, the response was left as is. If the respondent indicated an attrition rate over 59%, the response was recoded as

### Student Attrition

Asked about the attrition rate<sup>1</sup> of their program, respondents indicated that, on average, 14.0% of their students across disciplines failed to complete the program for the cohort that graduated in 2023.

### Enrollment Analysis<sup>2</sup>

Based on the survey responses, radiography programs enrolled an average of 26.4 students in 2024. This represents an increase of 2.3 students per program from 2023, when each radiography program enrolled an average of 24.1 students. This produces an overall estimate of 19,815 students entering ARRT-approved radiography programs in 2024, up from 17,679 in 2023.

On average, radiation therapy programs enrolled 16.6 students in 2024 compared to 13.4 students in 2023, an increase of 3.2 students per program. This produces an overall estimate of 1,663 students enrolling in ARRT-approved radiation therapy programs in 2024, up from 1,302 in 2023.

On average, NMT programs enrolled 15.1 students in 2024. This represents an increase of 5.5 students per program from 2023 when, on average, 9.6 students enrolled in each NMT program. Overall, this produces an estimate of 1,403 students enrolling in NMT programs in 2024, up from 903 in 2023.

Sonography programs enrolled an average of 21.9 students in 2024, up 7.9 students from 14.0 students per program in 2023. This produces an estimate of 5,511 students enrolling in ARRT-recognized sonography programs in 2024, up from 3,144 in 2023.

MRI programs enrolled an average of 14.8 students in 2024, up from 9.3 in 2023, an increase of 5.5 students per program. This produces an estimate of 1,004 students enrolled in all ARRT-recognized MRI programs in 2024, up from 555 in 2023.

(1-x) where x = *uncoded user response*. For this reason, reported attrition means on the last three Enrollment Snapshots will be noticeably lower than they have been in previous years.

<sup>2</sup> See tables in the body of the report for statistical testing results and confidence intervals.


## Demographics

Indicate your program type.


Discipline	Sample n	Sample %	Population N	Population %	Sample Return as Percent of Population
Radiography	286	69.4%	750	59.4%	38.1%
Radiation Therapy	40	9.7%	100	7.9%	40.0%
Nuclear Medicine Technology	22	5.3%	93	7.4%	23.7%
Sonography	34	8.3%	252	20.0%	13.5%
Magnetic Resonance Imaging	30	7.3%	68	5.4%	44.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>412</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1,263</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>32.6%</b>

Note. See "Representation" in the executive summary for further information about the population and sample proportions.

Indicate your program type.




Sample Return as Percent of Population



### What is your primary place of employment?

	N	Percent
Community college or two-year institution	172	48.0%
University or four-year institution	91	25.4%
Medical center	54	15.1%
Technical College	30	8.4%
For-profit school	11	3.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

### What is your primary place of employment?




**What is the terminal degree earned by the graduates in your program?**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Associate Degree	237	76.5%
Bachelor's Degree	73	23.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

*Note.* 48 additional respondents answered "Certificate" without indicating the terminal degree earned in their program.

**What is the terminal degree earned by the graduates in your program?**






**In what country is your program located?**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
United States	352	98.3%
Canada	5	1.4%
Australia	1	0.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>100.0%</b>


**In what country is your program located?**



If you chose the United States in the question above, please indicate in which region your program is located.

	N	Percent
South Atlantic (DE, MD, DC, VA, WV, NC, SC, GA, FL, PR)	79	22.2%
East North Central (WI, MI, IL, IN, OH)	58	16.5%
Mid-Atlantic (NY, PA, NJ)	43	12.3%
West North Central (ND, SD, NE, KS, MN, IA, MO)	40	11.4%
West South Central (OK, TX, AR, LA)	40	11.4%
East South Central (KY, TN, MS, AL)	26	7.4%
Mountain (ID, MT, WY, NV, UT, CO, AZ, NM)	26	7.4%
New England (ME, NH, VT, MA, RI, CT)	20	5.7%
Pacific (AK, WA, OR, CA, HI)	20	5.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

If you chose the United States in the question above, please indicate in which region your program is located.




## Overall Program Frequency Statistics

### How viable is your program over the next few years?

	N	Percent
Will definitely continue to operate	311	87.4%
Most likely will continue to operate	43	12.1%
Most likely will be closing	2	0.6%
Definitely will be closing	0	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>356</b>	<b>100.0%</b>


### How viable is your program over the next few years?



**Is your program currently at full enrollment?**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	237	66.2%
No	121	33.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>100.0%</b>


**Is your program currently at full enrollment?**



**Do you plan any changes related to enrollment?**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Plan to increase	99	27.7%
Plan to remain the same	250	70.0%
Plan to decrease	8	2.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>100.0%</b>


**Do you plan any changes related to enrollment?**




## Longitudinal Enrollment Trends by Discipline

Number of ARRT-approved programs by discipline:


### Radiography




### Radiation Therapy




### Nuclear Medicine Technology



### Sonography



### Magnetic Resonance Imaging




## Radiography

Year	ARRT recognized programs	Percent of programs responding to the survey with enrollment data	Mean number of students entering classroom	Estimated total students enrolled for all programs	Mean attrition Rate	Percent of programs not at full capacity	Mean additional students per program for those not at full capacity	Estimated total additional students for programs not at full capacity	Mean qualified students per program turned away	Estimated total qualified students turned away
2001	590	75.4%	21.2	12,508	21.6%	50.2%	.	.	.	.
2002	631	67.5%	23.4	14,734	23.6%	30.9%	8.7	1,696	31.6	13,778
2003	639	71.4%	23.4	14,965	21.6%	21.2%	5.8	786	46.8	23,565
2004	684	68.7%	22.9	15,684	20.5%	21.7%	7.5	1,113	55.1	29,510
2005	715	66.4%	22.8	16,333	18.1%	20.9%	7.4	1,106	50.9	28,787
2006	723	74.7%	24.0	17,323	18.4%	22.6%	7.0	1,144	59.2	33,128
2007	729	69.3%	22.8	16,614	17.8%	30.2%	7.1	1,563	56.8	28,902
2008	742	71.0%	23.0	17,066	21.1%	33.3%	8.4	2,076	50.4	24,944
2009	746	61.0%	22.5	16,785	20.8%	40.0%	3.7	1,104	43.4	19,426
2010	751	65.5%	21.2	15,948	23.3%	43.7%	7.6	2,490	39.1	16,528
2011	751	57.8%	21.9	16,454	25.8%	46.2%	7.6	2,637	37.1	14,978
2012	750	62.8%	20.9	15,645	29.1%	44.9%	8.3	2,785	39.5	16,336
2013	741	50.5%	21.8	16,154	27.9%	46.5%	7.8	2,688	36.3	14,391
2014	739	49.1%	20.6	15,211	31.2%	50.3%	7.2	2,682	34.1	12,522
2015	736	54.2%	20.7	15,228	36.7%	49.9%	8.7	3,195	27.7	10,214
2016	736	39.5%	21.1	15,537	18.2%	47.6%	6.6	2,326	23.6	9,102
2017	727	35.6%	21.7	15,769	18.5%	47.5%	8.3	2,849	30.8	11,756
2018	730	40.8%	22.4	16,374	15.0%	43.3%	7.1	2,235	26.6	11,002
2019	734	36.1%	21.8	15,972	16.5%	43.0%	6.1	1,922	23.2	9,694
2020	734	37.9%	21.3	15,620	15.6%	41.0%	6.3	1,905	21.4	9,254
2021	737	29.0%	21.0	15,477	12.7%	53.7%	7.0	2,770	25.2	8,599
2022	729	25.9%	22.3	16,235	11.9%	50.6%	5.8	2,136	29.2	10,505
2023	734	30.1%	24.1	17,679	15.0%	43.5%	6.7	2,136	32.6	13,511
<b>2024</b>	<b>750</b>	<b>38.1%</b>	<b>26.4</b>	<b>19,815</b>	<b>14.9%</b>	<b>34.3%</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>1,425</b>	<b>46.2</b>	<b>22,780</b>



**Estimated total number of students entering radiography programs:**




*Note.* The finite population correction factor was applied to the confidence interval.

## Radiation Therapy

Year	ARRT recognized programs	Percent of programs responding to the survey with enrollment data	Mean number of students entering classroom	Estimated total students enrolled for all programs	Mean attrition Rate	Percent of programs not at full capacity	Mean additional students per program for those not at full capacity	Estimated total additional students for programs not at full capacity	Mean qualified students per program turned away	Estimated total qualified students turned away
2001	86	60.5%	10.0	860	18.1%	44.4%	.	.	.	.
2002	95	58.9%	14.0	1,326	11.1%	48.0%	5.7	260	9.1	450
2003	101	57.4%	12.6	1,274	18.0%	44.6%	4.4	198	13.6	761
2004	105	55.2%	14.4	1,513	11.9%	30.5%	12.5	400	13.4	978
2005	113	63.7%	12.5	1,416	16.8%	32.1%	3.4	123	24.5	1,880
2006	118	68.6%	11.0	1,295	16.6%	49.3%	6.4	372	21.6	1,292
2007	122	57.4%	12.9	1,576	15.2%	51.5%	6.3	396	13.3	787
2008	125	49.6%	10.5	1,313	14.4%	58.6%	4.5	330	33.0	1,708
2009	122	50.8%	12.5	1,525	10.9%	55.5%	3.7	251	15.8	858
2010	122	58.2%	12.0	1,462	18.3%	49.3%	7.9	475	18.0	1,112
2011	123	42.3%	9.8	1,204	21.9%	51.9%	6.1	388	14.3	846
2012	122	48.4%	11.5	1,403	18.9%	53.4%	6.9	451	14.4	818
2013	121	55.4%	12.5	1,513	21.8%	57.6%	5.7	397	17.1	877
2014	117	45.3%	13.2	1,544	26.5%	49.1%	6.2	355	15.7	935
2015	113	49.6%	13.9	1,572	24.6%	55.4%	7.1	444	14.8	746
2016	110	35.5%	10.8	1,185	7.3%	60.5%	4.6	309	11.3	492
2017	110	33.6%	10.5	1,151	10.0%	43.2%	5.2	247	16.0	998
2018	109	37.6%	12.4	1,356	9.4%	43.9%	7.7	369	29.0	1,773
2019	106	29.2%	10.9	1,155	7.0%	58.1%	4.1	250	16.4	726
2020	107	36.4%	11.1	1,182	7.4%	68.0%	7.1	518	14.2	485
2021	109	33.0%	11.7	1,275	8.9%	33.3%	6.9	250	18.9	1,374
2022	99	29.3%	12.2	1,208	9.2%	69.6%	4.5	310	9.6	288
2023	97	41.2%	13.4	1,302	7.0%	48.6%	8.3	390	15.3	763
<b>2024</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>40.0%</b>	<b>16.6</b>	<b>1,663</b>	<b>10.6%</b>	<b>45.5%</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>18.5</b>	<b>1,010</b>

Estimated total number of students entering radiation therapy programs:

2024 Confidence Interval at the 95% Level =  $\pm 309$




Note. The finite population correction factor was applied to the confidence interval.

## Nuclear Medicine Technology

Year	ARRT recognized programs	Percent of programs responding to survey with enrollment data	Mean number of students entering classroom	Estimated total students enrolled for all programs	Mean attrition Rate	Percent of programs not at full capacity	Mean additional students per program for those not at full capacity	Estimated total additional students for programs not at full capacity	Mean qualified students per program turned away	Estimated total qualified students turned away
2001	101	62.4%	12.4	1,252	11.8%	53.2%	.	.	.	.
2002	104	55.8%	14.0	1,454	8.0%	35.7%	6.7	249	19.7	1,317
2003	111	59.5%	14.5	1,612	7.1%	33.3%	2.7	100	32.1	2,377
2004	117	58.1%	14.0	1,633	9.8%	20.9%	3.6	88	24.4	2,258
2005	122	57.4%	13.7	1,673	8.6%	30.6%	5.1	190	32.9	2,786
2006	131	71.8%	15.5	2,033	10.2%	31.8%	5.7	237	30.2	2,698
2007	132	56.8%	13.5	1,781	8.3%	39.7%	6.3	330	24.2	1,926
2008	136	59.6%	12.2	1,659	12.3%	58.4%	10.0	794	18.2	1,030
2009	136	48.5%	10.8	1,469	7.0%	63.0%	4.3	368	9.3	468
2010	136	48.5%	11.3	1,534	12.9%	78.8%	7.0	748	12.9	372
2011	134	47.0%	8.8	1,175	11.3%	82.5%	7.2	796	8.0	187
2012	134	56.7%	10.5	1,407	18.4%	73.0%	8.7	851	6.4	231
2013	128	46.9%	10.0	1,280	23.8%	76.1%	7.9	770	7.8	239
2014	125	42.4%	8.5	1,061	36.7%	79.2%	8.1	802	8.3	216
2015	122	50.8%	10.5	1,276	17.3%	68.9%	6.0	504	4.5	171
2016	120	33.3%	11.4	1,368	11.1%	67.5%	7.8	632	3.2	124
2017	117	27.4%	10.9	1,273	9.3%	71.9%	6.7	559	2.5	82
2018	117	23.1%	11.0	1,287	8.1%	59.3%	11.0	761	8.8	418
2019	116	22.4%	9.7	1,129	15.0%	53.8%	4.4	276	2.1	114
2020	116	21.6%	9.3	1,076	14.0%	46.4%	6.3	339	3.7	231
2021	115	21.7%	11.3	1,300	10.2%	52.0%	4.4	263	4.1	226
2022	94	14.9%	8.9	837	7.5%	77.8%	3.9	282	2.0	42
2023	94	24.5%	9.6	903	12.0%	58.8%	6.6	365	3.7	144
<b>2024</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>23.7%</b>	<b>15.1</b>	<b>1,403</b>	<b>11.1%</b>	<b>41.2%</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>40.4</b>	<b>2,211</b>

**Estimated total number of students entering nuclear medicine technology programs:**

**2024 Confidence Interval at the 95% Level =  $\pm 1,410$**




*Note.* The finite population correction factor was applied to the confidence interval.

## Sonography

Year	ARRT recognized programs	Percent of programs responding to survey with enrollment data	Mean number of students entering classroom	Estimated total students enrolled for all programs	Mean attrition Rate	Percent of programs not at full capacity	Mean additional students per program for those not at full capacity	Estimated total additional students for programs not at full capacity	Mean qualified students per program turned away	Estimated total qualified students turned away
2022	214	14.0%	16.5	3,531	16.2%	63.6%	6.0	817	4.5	351
2023	224	12.9%	14.0	3,144	14.0%	15.4%	4.0	138	39.4	7,474
<b>2024</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>13.5%</b>	<b>21.9</b>	<b>5,511</b>	<b>13.7%</b>	<b>10.0%</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>49.0</b>	<b>11,113</b>

### Estimated total number of students entering sonography programs:




Note. The finite population correction factor was applied to the confidence interval.

### Magnetic Resonance Imaging

Year	ARRT recognized programs	Percent of programs responding to survey with enrollment data	Mean number of students entering classroom	Estimated total students enrolled for all programs	Mean attrition Rate	Percent of programs not at full capacity	Mean additional students per program for those not at full capacity	Estimated total additional students for programs not at full capacity	Mean qualified students per program turned away	Estimated total qualified students turned away
2022	61	49.2%	11.8	720	4.1%	75.0%	10.0	458	0	0
2023	60	53.3%	9.3	555	6.0%	62.5%	4.4	165	1.67	38
2024	68	44.1%	14.8	1,004	2.2%	66.7%	3.7	166	36.0	815

### Estimated total number of students entering magnetic resonance imaging programs:

2024 Confidence Interval at the 95% Level =  $\pm 206$



Note. The finite population correction factor was applied to the confidence interval.

## Discipline Comparisons


### Number of students entering classroom

	Mean	N	SD	CI of Mean at 95% Level	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Radiography	26.4	286	19.3	24.7	28.2
Sonography	21.9	34	18.5	16.1	27.7
Radiation Therapy	16.6	40	12.8	13.5	19.7
Nuclear Medicine Technology	15.1	22	12.0	10.7	19.5
Magnetic Resonance Imaging	14.8	30	11.2	11.7	17.8

Note. The finite population correction factor was applied to the CIs.

The Kruskal-Wallis test<sup>3</sup> showed an overall statistically significant difference in the number of students entering by discipline,  $\chi^2(4, n = 412) = 58.5, P < .001$ . Post hoc comparisons using the adjusted Bonferroni correction indicated that radiography was statistically different from radiation therapy, nuclear medicine technology, and magnetic resonance imaging,  $\alpha = .05$ .

### Number of students entering classroom (Mean)



<sup>3</sup> The Kruskal-Wallis test was used when the assumptions of normality and equality of variance for the one-way ANOVA were not met.




### Additional students per program for those not at full capacity

	Mean	N	SD	CI of Mean at 95% Level	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Nuclear Medicine Technology	7.3	7	3.1	5.0	9.6
Radiation Therapy	5.9	15	7.5	2.2	9.7
Radiography	5.5	86	4.9	4.5	6.6
Magnetic Resonance Imaging	3.7	3	2.9	0.0	6.9
Sonography	1.0	1	.	.	.
<b>Total</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>6.6</b>

Note. The finite population correction factor was applied to the CIs.

The Kruskal-Wallis test showed no overall statistically significant difference in the number of additional students by discipline,  $\chi^2(4, n = 112) = 6.46, P = .168$ .

### Additional students per program for those not at full capacity (Mean)




### How many qualified students did you turn away this fall?

	Mean	N	SD	CI of Mean at 95% Level	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Sonography	49.0	5	31.7	21.2	76.8
Radiography	46.2	150	49.2	38.4	54.1
Nuclear Medicine Technology	40.4	9	83.5	0.0	95.0
Magnetic Resonance Imaging	36.0	2	48.1	0.0	102.6
Radiation Therapy	18.5	15	23.9	6.5	30.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>43.6</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>49.5</b>	<b>36.4</b>	<b>50.8</b>

Note. The finite population correction factor was applied to the CIs.

The Kruskal-Wallis test showed an overall statistically significant difference in the number of qualified students turned away by discipline,  $\chi^2(4, n = 181) = 14.8, P = .005$ . Post hoc comparisons using the adjusted Bonferroni correction indicated that radiography was statistically different from radiation therapy;  $\alpha = .05$ .

### How many qualified students did you turn away this fall? (Mean)




### Attrition Rate

	Mean	N	SD	CI of Mean at 95% Level	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Radiography	14.9%	246	15.5%	13.3%	16.4%
Sonography	13.7%	10	8.9%	8.3%	19.1%
Nuclear Medicine Technology	11.1%	17	12.6%	5.7%	16.6%
Radiation Therapy	10.6%	32	20.0%	4.8%	16.3%
Magnetic Resonance Imaging	2.2%	5	4.9%	0.0%	6.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>14.0%</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>15.7%</b>	<b>12.5%</b>	<b>15.5%</b>

Note. The finite population correction factor was applied to the CIs.

The Kruskal-Wallis test showed an overall statistically significant difference in the attrition rate by discipline,  $\chi^2(4, n = 310) = 16.4, P = .003$ . Post hoc comparisons using the adjusted Bonferroni correction indicated that radiography was statistically different from radiation therapy,  $P = .022, \alpha = .05$ .

### Attrition Rate (Mean)




### How viable is your program over the next few years?

		S	R	MR	T	N	Overall
Will definitely continue to operate	N	9	222	5	25	11	272
	%	90.0%	88.8%	83.3%	78.1%	64.7%	86.3%
Most likely will continue to operate	N	1	27	1	7	5	41
	%	10.0%	10.8%	16.7%	21.9%	29.4%	13.0%
Most likely will be closing	N	0	1	0	0	1	2
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	0.6%
Definitely will be closing	N	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>315</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

A chi-square test was not conducted because more than 20% of the cells had expected counts below 5, and at least one cell had an expected count below 1.

### How viable is your program over the next few years?




### Is your program currently at full enrollment?

		S	R	N	T	MR	Overall
Yes	N	9	165	10	18	2	204
	%	90.0%	65.7%	58.8%	54.5%	33.3%	64.4%
No	N	1	86	7	15	4	113
	%	10.0%	34.3%	41.2%	45.5%	66.7%	35.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>317</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

A chi-square test was not conducted because more than 20% of the cells had expected counts below 5.

### Is your program currently at full enrollment?




### Do you plan any changes related to enrollment?

		N	T	R	S	MR	Overall
Plan to increase	N	6	10	72	0	0	88
	%	35.3%	30.3%	28.7%	0.0%	0.0%	27.8%
Plan to remain the same	N	11	23	174	10	5	223
	%	64.7%	69.7%	69.3%	100.0%	83.3%	70.3%
Plan to decrease	N	0	0	5	0	1	6
	%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	16.7%	1.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>317</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

A chi-square test was not conducted because more than 20% of the cells had expected counts below 5, and at least one cell had an expected count below 1.

### Do you plan any changes related to enrollment?




## Primary Place of Employment Comparisons

### Number of students entering classroom

	Mean	N	SD	CI of Mean at 95% Level	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
University or four-year institution	36.8	87	56.0	25.1	48.6
For-profit school	36.8	11	14.1	28.4	45.1
Community college or two-year institution	27.5	27	19.8	20.0	35.0
Technical College	26.5	170	18.6	23.7	29.3
Medical center	15.3	50	9.9	12.6	18.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>27.7</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>32.1</b>	<b>24.3</b>	<b>31.0</b>

The Kruskal-Wallis test showed an overall statistically significant difference in the number of students entering by institution type,  $\chi^2(4, n = 352) = 44.1, P < .001$ . Post hoc comparisons using the adjusted Bonferroni correction indicated that medical center was statistically different from the other institutions,  $\alpha = .05$ .

### Number of students entering classroom (Mean)




**Additional students per program for those not at full capacity**

	Mean	N	SD	CI of Mean at 95% Level	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
For-profit school	14.8	5	12.0	4.3	25.3
University or four-year institution	6.4	33	5.6	4.5	8.3
Community college or two-year institution	6.0	47	7.0	4.0	8.0
Medical center	5.8	25	4.5	4.1	7.6
Technical College	2.5	6	1.9	1.0	4.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>7.3</b>

The Kruskal-Wallis test revealed no overall statistically significant difference in the number of additional students by institution type,  $\chi^2(4, n = 120) = 9.14, P = .058$ .

**Additional students per program for those not at full capacity (Mean)**






### How many qualified students did you turn away this fall?

	Mean	N	SD	CI of Mean at 95% Level	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Technical College	62.9	21	65.2	35.1	90.8
Community college or two-year institution	51.6	120	58.0	41.2	61.9
For-profit school	43.5	4	42.5	1.8	85.2
University or four-year institution	43.0	45	51.9	27.9	58.2
Medical center	23.8	22	16.3	17.0	30.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>47.8</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>54.8</b>	<b>40.5</b>	<b>55.2</b>

The Kruskal-Wallis test revealed no overall statistically significant difference in the number of qualified students turned away by institution type,  $\chi^2(4, n = 212) = 6.57, P = .161$ .

### How many qualified students did you turn away this fall? (Mean)




## Attrition Rate

	Mean	N	SD	CI of Mean at 95% Level	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Community college or two-year institution	16.9%	167	16.8%	14.3%	19.5%
Technical College	15.6%	30	13.7%	10.7%	20.5%
For-profit school	15.3%	11	10.7%	9.0%	21.6%
Medical center	10.9%	53	15.9%	6.6%	15.1%
University or four-year institution	8.2%	90	10.4%	6.1%	10.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>13.6%</b>	<b>351</b>	<b>15.2%</b>	<b>12.0%</b>	<b>15.2%</b>

The Kruskal-Wallis test showed an overall statistically significant difference in attrition rate by institution type,  $\chi^2(4, n = 351) = 33.6, P < .001$ . Post hoc comparisons using the adjusted Bonferroni correction indicated that community college was statistically different from medical center and university; technical college was statistically different from university,  $\alpha = .05$ .

## Attrition Rate




### How viable is your program over the next few years?

		Technical College	Community college or two-year institution	University or four-year institution	Medical center	For-profit school	Overall
Will definitely continue to operate	N	27	153	78	44	9	311
	%	90.0%	89.5%	85.7%	83.0%	81.8%	87.4%
Most likely will continue to operate	N	3	17	12	9	2	43
	%	10.0%	9.9%	13.2%	17.0%	18.2%	12.1%
Most likely will be closing	N	0	1	1	0	0	2
	%	0.0%	0.6%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%
Definitely will be closing	N	0	0	0	0	0	0
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>356</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

A chi-square test was not conducted because more than 20% of the cells had expected counts below 5, and at least one cell had an expected count below 1.

### How viable is your program over the next few years?




### Is your program currently at full enrollment?

		Technical College	Community college or two-year institution	University or four-year institution	For-profit school	Medical center	Overall
Yes	N	22	125	58	6	26	237
	%	73.3%	72.7%	63.7%	54.5%	48.1%	66.2%
No	N	8	47	33	5	28	121
	%	26.7%	27.3%	36.3%	45.5%	51.9%	33.8%
Total	N	30	172	91	11	54	358
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

A chi-square test indicated that the proportional difference in the response distribution was statistically significant,  $\chi^2(4, n = 358) = 12.7, P = .013$ . Post hoc comparisons using the adjusted Bonferroni correction revealed that community college was statistically different from medical center,  $\alpha = .005$ . Cramér's V indicated a small effect size,  $V = .188$ .

### Is your program currently at full enrollment?



### Do you plan any changes related to enrollment?

		For-profit school	Medical Center	Community college or two-year institution	University or four-year institution	Technical College	Overall
Plan to increase	N	4	19	48	23	5	99
	%	36.4%	35.8%	27.9%	25.3%	16.7%	27.7%
Plan to remain the same	N	7	33	120	65	25	250
	%	63.6%	62.3%	69.8%	71.4%	83.3%	70.0%
Plan to decrease	N	0	1	4	3	0	8
	%	0.0%	1.9%	2.3%	3.3%	0.0%	2.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>357</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

A chi-square test was not conducted because more than 20% of the cells had expected counts below 5, and at least one cell had an expected count below 1.

### Do you plan any changes related to enrollment?

