



Calendar-Year Program Report



Program Title: PTA
Calendar Year: 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Courses and Outcomes Assessed (entered by director of assessment)2
Aggregate Report (entered by director of assessment)3
Discussion of Results (completed at symposia).....4
Data-Driven Decisions (completed at symposia)5
Resource Allocation Requests (completed at symposia)6
Suggestions for Improving the Assessment Process (completed at symposia)8

Appendix: Qualitative and Contextual Information from Taskstream (entered by director of assessment)9

COURSES AND OUTCOMES ASSESSED

ISLO #1: Communication – O,W
PSLO 1.1 -- Communication

PHTA 204
PHTA 205
PHTA 209 (M)

ISLO #2: Critical Thinking – Problem Solving
PSLO 1.8 – Problem Solving

PHTA 204
PHTA 205
PHTA 209 (M)

AGGREGATE REPORT

| Assessment Results - AACU VALUE Rubric for ISLO 1 - PSLO 1.1 | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------|--|
| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Course</u> | <u>Sections Participating</u> | <u>Total Measures</u> | <u>Outcome</u> | <u>Semester</u> | |
| PHTA | 204 | 1 | 1 | Met | Fall | |
| PHTA | 205 | 1 | 1 | Met | Fall | |
| PHTA | 209(M) | | | Unable to assess | Spring | |
| <u>Program Title Courses - Overall Findings for PSLO 1</u> | | | | | | |
| Total Sections Selected for Assessment | | | | | | |
| Total Sections Assessed | | | | | | |
| % Sections Meeting or Exceeding Target (of those assessed) | | | | | | |
| <u>Recommendations, Reflections, and Notes:</u> | | | | | | |
| Appended. | | | | | | |

| Assessment Results - AACU VALUE Rubric for ISLO 2 – PSLO 1.8 | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Course</u> | <u>Sections Participating</u> | <u>Total Measures</u> | <u>Outcome</u> | <u>Semester</u> | |
| PHTA | 204 | 1 | 1 | Met | Fall | |
| PHTA | 205 | | | No findings Entered for CT measure | Fall | |
| PHTA | 209(M) | | | Unable to assess | | |
| <u>Program Title Courses - Overall Findings for PSLO 8</u> | | | | | | |
| Total Sections Selected for Assessment | | | | | | |
| Total Sections Assessed | | | | | | |
| % Sections Meeting or Exceeding Target (of those assessed) | | | | | | |
| <u>Recommendations, Reflections, and Notes:</u> | | | | | | |
| Appended. | | | | | | |

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Directions: This portion of the document is designed to provide context for results, to discuss individual instructors' input on whether or not the methods they are using are effective.

Some questions to consider: is the assessment process for the outcome you're assessing sufficiently robust?

Are enough sections of the course being assessed to represent an accurate portrayal of program success?

If the targets have been met, might they be raised in the future?

If targets are consistently exceeded, might the assignment be made more demanding to challenge students effectively?

DATA DRIVEN DECISIONS

Directions: What will you change as a result of the data?

If targets are not met: best practices suggest we make changes to course content, rubrics, or the assessment process, and spend the next cycle year reviewing the courses for which we didn't meet targets *in addition to* the PSLOs up for that cycle year. If there are problems, we want to catch them quickly. So, if targets are not met, what will be changed, and what is the timeline for addressing the issue?

If targets are met: Many people are under the impression that as long as targets are met, then there is no need to make changes. As evidenced in the directions in the previous section, we can still make changes. Perhaps a new target would be appropriate? Perhaps the assignment should be more challenging for students? Perhaps a more robust measurement of the PSLO or ISLO could be made?

RESOURCE ALLOCATION REQUESTS

RESOURCE ALLOCATION REQUEST FORM

Guidelines for Request:

1. Please ensure the request is linked to learning outcomes (course, program, and/or institutional)
2. Complete this form and send it to your academic dean for review and potential consideration at Provost's Cabinet.

PROPOSAL INFORMATION:

Applicant's Name: _____

Program Title: _____

- a. Please describe the request (what is the problem that the request is trying to solve?)
- b. Describe and or list the resource(s) you hope to acquire as a result of this request. (For instance, are you looking for course materials, additional instructors, etc.? What is the problem that this request is trying to solve?)
- c. How is the request linked to learning outcomes assessment?
- d. Please include any data that will help support this request (learning outcomes data)
- e. Describe briefly your follow-up assessment (currently we assess on a three-year cycle, but learning outcomes that are addressed with resource allocation should be assessed again as soon as possible to determine the viability and sustainability of resource allocation)
- f. Please include any alternative sources of funding you have considered for this initiative (grants, different pools of money on campus, etc.)
- g. Approximately how many students do you anticipate will be served by this request each Academic year?

h. Total Amount Requested: _____

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Directions: some proposed areas of improvement might include: collection of data, distribution of data, what kinds of data is included/omitted, timelines, when or how work is completed, delegation of responsibilities, etc.

APPENDIX A: QUALITATIVE AND CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION FROM TASKSTREAM

PHTA 204

Recommendations:

This year the assignment was changed from being an exam so students were able to complete the assignment using their notes. Given the high level of synthesis of material required for this assignment, it should be continued as an assignment versus an exam.

Reflections/Notes:

Although the hypothesis section was slightly below the 80% threshold, overall students demonstrated competency with problem solving. The hypothesis section is quite high level, actually more in line with what a PT would need to do, but it gives a good picture of the student's higher level critical thinking skills and the ability to put multiple pieces of information together to generate a possible hypothesis. Interestingly, but not surprising given the nature of our pathology courses, 3 of the 4 students who received a 1, were students who did not pass the course.