

**Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2018-19** Consult with your college dean's office regarding due date and how to submit. Deans will submit reports to the Office of Assessment & Accreditation annually by October 15

**Unit/Program Name:** Doctorate in Athletic Training (DAT) **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** Lindsey Eberman [Lindsey.Eberman@indstate.edu](mailto:Lindsey.Eberman@indstate.edu)

**Part 1a: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment**

<p><b>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year?</b></p> <p>If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p><b>b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</b></p>	<p><b>c. What were your expectations for student performance?</b></p>	<p><b>d. What were the actual data/results?</b></p>	<p><b>e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report? Can expand on this in Part 2.</b></p>
<p><i>Patient-Centered Care – Students will demonstrate the ability to provide patient-centered care.</i></p> <p><i>Specific Learning Objectives – Students will demonstrate the ability:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– To identify, respect, and care about patients' differences, values, preferences, and expressed needs</li> <li>– To listen to, clearly inform, communicate with, and educate patients</li> <li>– To share decision making and management</li> <li>– To continuously advocate disease prevention, wellness, and promotion of healthy lifestyles</li> <li>– To recognize and intervene in any conflict of interest that could adversely affect the patient's health</li> <li>– To facilitate collaboration among the patient, physician, family, and other members of the patient's social network or healthcare system to develop an effective treatment plan</li> </ul> <p>Aligns with G1 and G3 Graduate Student Learning Goals.</p>	<p><b><u>Assignments and Measures:</u></b></p> <p>Standardized Patient Encounters (Courses – ATTR 710, 720, 840, 830)</p> <p>Clinical Site Supervisor Evaluations (Courses – ATTR 755, 756, 855, 856)</p> <p>Clinical Experiences Survey (Courses – ATTR 755, 756, 855, 856)</p> <p>Exit Survey</p>	<p>80% of students score an 80% or higher on their final encounter (ATTR 830).</p> <p>Students ratings average 3.5/5 or better for integrating patient-centered care into their practice</p> <p>Students are able to integrate patient-centered care at least 80% of the time in their patient care. Students rate themselves at an average or 3.5/5 or better for their effectiveness in integrating patient-centered care into their practice.</p> <p>80% of students score that the program prepared them to integrate patient-centered care into practice at 3.5/5 or better</p> <p>80% of alumni score that the program prepared them to integrate patient-centered care into practice at 3.5/5 or better</p>	<p>20% of students scored an 80% or higher on their final encounter (avg=56%)</p> <p>Students were rated as "exceptional" (avg=4.7/5) for integrating patient-centered care into their practice</p> <p>Students integrate patient-centered care into their practice 83% of the time and rate themselves as "very effective" (avg=3.9/5).</p> <p>91.7% of students scored that the program was "very effective" and 8.3% of students scored the program was "effective" at preparing them to integrate</p>	<p>Overall, these collective data indicate that the program is meeting its learning objectives relative to patient-centered care.</p> <p>In AY18-19, we changed to a different assessment tool. Both the previous tool and the new tool have been used in research and are valid measures of patient-centered care performance. Using the previous assessment tools, 100% of students in the Class of 2017, and 75% of students in Class of 2018 met the 80% benchmark. To improve our standardized patient scoring practices, we have a professional development session scheduled on July 16<sup>th</sup> to improve rater reliability and discuss bias in scoring (specific to initial encounters). During that meeting, we will discuss the benchmark to determine if a change is necessary. It is also possible the program needs to collect more data using the new</p>

	<p>Alumni Survey</p> <p>Employer Survey</p>	<p>80% of employers score that the program prepared them to integrate patient-centered care into practice at 3.5/5 or better</p>	<p>patient centered care into their practice (avg=4.92)</p> <p>71.4% of students scored that the program was “very effective” and 28.6% of students scored the program was “effective” at preparing them to integrate patient centered care into their practice (avg=4.71)</p> <p>Unable to assess at this time.</p>	<p>tool before action is taken. The new tool has been developed for this particular activity (assessing the healthcare core competencies in a standardized patient encounter) and will allow us to monitor progress more consistently across evaluators and between encounters. The tool is more consistent with the Dreyfus Model of skill acquisition and the Athletic Training Milestones, which are becoming standard assessments in post-professional athletic training education.</p> <p>Data from the clinical site supervisor evaluations, clinical experiences survey, exit and alumni surveys all indicate that graduates believe the program was effective at preparing them to integrate patient-centered care into their practice.</p> <p>The DAT core faculty, affiliate faculty, and PHD students will continue to collaborate to deliver the standardized patient encounters at the various time points in the curriculum.</p>
<p><i>Interprofessional Education and Collaborative Practice</i> – Students will demonstrate the ability to engage in collaborative practice.</p> <p>Specific Learning Objectives – Students will demonstrate the ability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– To cooperate, collaborate, communicate, and integrate care in teams to ensure that care is continuous and reliable</li> <li>– To listen to, clearly inform, communicate with, and</li> </ul>	<p><b>Assignments and Measures:</b></p> <p>Interprofessional Standardized Patient Encounter (Courses – ATTR 756)</p> <p>Interprofessional Roles and Responsibilities Discussions (Courses – ATTR 855)</p> <p>Clinical Site Supervisor Evaluations (Courses – ATTR 755, 756, 855, 856)</p>	<p>80% of students score an 80% or higher on their encounter</p> <p>80% of students score an 80% or higher on this learning activity</p> <p>Students ratings average 3.5/5 or better for integrating interprofessional and</p>	<p>73% of students scored an 80% or higher on their encounter (avg=84.2%)</p> <p>91% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=97%)</p> <p>Students were rated as “exceptional” (avg=4.5/5) for integrating interprofessional and collaborative care into their</p>	<p>Overall these data indicate that the program is meeting its learning objectives relative to interprofessional education and collaborative practice. Data from the clinical experience survey indicates that students are only able to integrate interprofessional and collaborative practice 52% of the time, but they do feel very effective when engaged in</p>

<p>educate patients</p> <p>Aligns with G5 Graduate Student Learning Goals.</p>	<p>Clinical Experiences Survey (Courses – ATTR 755, 756, 855, 856)</p> <p>Exit Survey</p> <p>Alumni Survey</p> <p>Employer Survey</p>	<p>collaborative care into their practice</p> <p>Students are able to integrate interprofessional and collaborative care at least 80% of the time in their patient care. Students rate themselves at an average of 3.5/5 or better for their effectiveness in integrating interprofessional and collaborative care into their practice.</p> <p>80% of students score that the program prepared them to integrate interprofessional and collaborative care into practice at 3.5/5 or better</p> <p>80% of alumni score that the program prepared them to integrate interprofessional and collaborative care into practice at 3.5/5 or better</p> <p>80% of employers score that the program prepared them to integrate interprofessional and collaborative care into practice at 3.5/5 or better</p>	<p>practice</p> <p>Students integrate interprofessional and collaborative care into their practice 52% of the time and rate themselves as “very effective” (avg=3.8/5).</p> <p>66.7% of students scored that the program was “very effective” and 33.3% of students scored the program was “effective” at preparing them to integrate interprofessional and collaborative care into their practice (avg=4.67)</p> <p>57.1% of students scored that the program was “very effective” and 38.1% of students scored the program was “effective” at preparing them to integrate interprofessional and collaborative care into their practice (avg=4.52)</p> <p>Unable to assess at this time.</p>	<p>interprofessional and collaborative practice. We implemented several course activities (the interprofessional standardized patient experience and the interprofessional roles and responsibilities discussions into the curriculum over the past few years to try and increase engagement in this practice. In addition, we have made a curricular change that requires students to take a 1 credit Innovations in Collaborative Healthcare to enhance this part of the curriculum. This new course will be implemented for the first time in Summer 2019. There are multiple offerings (e.g. Telemedicine, Advanced Patient Outcomes) but there is one central requirement, a collaborative project within the course. These projects will be added to the assessment plan and we will seek qualitative feedback on these courses in our semester debriefing process. Data from the exit and alumni surveys indicate that graduates believe the program was effective at preparing them to integrate interprofessional and collaborative practice into their work.</p> <p>Course instructors will be asked to provide assignment descriptions and data analysis for these courses at the end of the summer session. Core faculty, affiliate faculty, and PHD students will discuss the findings during our August Strategic Planning Meeting.</p>
--	---	---	---	---

<p><i>Evidence-Based Practice</i> – Students will demonstrate the ability to engage in evidence-based practice.</p> <p>Specific Learning Objectives – Students will demonstrate the ability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– To integrate best research with clinical expertise and patient values for optimum care</li> <li>– To participate in learning and research activities</li> </ul> <p>Aligns with G4 Graduate Student Learning Goals.</p>	<p><b><u>Assignments and Measures:</u></b></p> <p>Clinical Bottom Line Papers (Courses – ATTR 712, ATTR 840)</p> <p>Diagnostic Algorithms (Courses – ATTR 810, ATTR 720)</p> <p>Traditional Research Project (Courses – ATTR 691, ATTR 798 [I, II, III])</p> <p>Clinical Site Supervisor Evaluations (Courses – ATTR 755, 756, 855, 856)</p>	<p>80% of students score an 80% or higher on this assignment</p> <p>80% of students score an 80% or higher on this assignment</p> <p>80% of students score an 80% or higher on these traditional research project assignments</p> <p>Students ratings average 3.5/5 or better for integrating evidence-based practice into their practice</p>	<p>87% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=88%) in ATTR 712 Presentations – 44% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=74%) in ATTR 712 63% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=80.3%) in ATTR 840</p> <p>100% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=97%) in ATTR 810 92% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=88.5%) in ATTR 720</p> <p>Proposal – 91% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=88%) Proposal Presentation – 82% of students scored 80% or higher (avg=85%) Intro/Methods – 45% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=81%) Abstract – 100% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=95%) Manuscript – 79% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=86%) Research Contract – 88% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=96%) Thematic Poster Presentation – 84% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=88%)</p> <p>Students were rated as “exceptional” (avg=4.6/5) for integrating evidence-based practice into their practice</p>	<p>Overall data indicate that the program is meeting its learning objectives relative to evidence-based practice. The data from the Clinical Bottom Line presentation comes from the first semester in the program. Students are often poorly prepared for professional presentations and as such, this data is indicative of low oral presentation skills at the onset of the program. The second Clinical Bottom Line paper required in ATTR 840 (Fall II) suggests that students are not improving or maintaining their ability to synthesize literature in this format. However, the data from the traditional research project indicates improvements from drafting of the introduction and methods assignment (Spring I) to the final manuscript (Spring II) suggests information synthesis and data analysis is improving. Data from the exit and alumni surveys indicate that graduates believe the program was effective at preparing them to integrate evidence into their practice.</p> <p>The Class of 2019 has an on-time completion rate of 95.8% (n=23/24 eligible students), which demonstrates successful completion of research expectations in the program for a large majority of students.</p> <p>During the August Strategic Planning Meeting, the core faculty, affiliate faculty, and PHD</p>
--	--	---	---	---

	<p>Clinical Experiences Survey (Courses – ATTR 755, 756, 855, 856)</p> <p>Exit Survey</p> <p>Alumni Survey</p> <p>Employer Survey</p>	<p>Students are able to integrate evidence-based practice at least 80% of the time in their patient care. Students rate themselves at an average or 3.5/5 or better for their effectiveness in integrating evidence-based practice into their practice.</p> <p>80% of students score that the program prepared them to integrate evidence-based practice into practice at 3.5/5 or better</p> <p>80% of alumni score that the program prepared them to integrate evidence-based practice into practice at 3.5/5 or better</p> <p>80% of employers score that the program prepared them to integrate evidence-based practice into practice at 3.5/5 or better</p>	<p>Students integrate evidence-based practice into their practice 76% of the time and rate themselves as “very effective” (avg=3.7/5).</p> <p>66.7% of students scored that the program was “very effective” and 33.3% of students scored the program was “effective” at preparing them to integrate evidence-based practice into their practice (avg=4.67)</p> <p>71.4% of students scored that the program was “very effective” and 28.6% of students scored the program was “effective” at preparing them to integrate evidence-based practice into their practice (avg=4.71)</p> <p>Unable to assess at this time.</p>	<p>students will discuss a standard evaluation tool for the Clinical Bottom Line Paper, so that we can better monitor progress on this skill.</p>
<p><i>Quality Improvement</i> – Students will demonstrate the ability to engage in quality improvement strategies to change their own clinical practice.</p> <p>Specific Learning Objectives – Students will demonstrate the ability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– To identify errors and hazards in your own care</li> <li>– To continually understand and measure quality of care in terms of structure, process, and outcomes in relation to patient needs</li> <li>– To design and test interventions to change</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Assignments and Measures:</u></b> Program Development Plan, Individualized Goal Setting, and Comprehensive Exam Reflections (Courses – ATTR 755, 756, 855, 856)</p>	<p>80% of students score an 80% or higher on these reflection and goal setting assignments</p>	<p>Goal Setting – 73% of students scored 80% or higher (avg=83%) in ATTR 755 Goal Setting – 96% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=95.6%) in ATTR 756 Goal Setting – 92% of students scored 80% or higher (avg=85%) in ATTR 855</p> <p>End of the Semester Goal Reflection and Action Plan – 100% of students scored 80% or higher (avg=99%) in ATTR 755</p>	<p>Overall data indicate that the program is meeting its learning objectives relative to quality improvement. Although students were meeting expectations for the individualized goal setting assignment, the program faculty worked to refine this assignment and has implemented a more rigorous and program focused template. The PDP requires the student to explore the points of</p>

<p>processes and systems of care with the objective of improving quality</p> <p>Aligns with G5 Graduate Student Learning Goals.</p>	<p>Practice-Based Research Project (Courses – ATTR 811, ATTR 798 [II, III])</p> <p>Moot Court (Courses – ATTR 726)</p> <p>Clinical Site Supervisor Evaluations (Courses – ATTR 755, 756, 855, 856)</p> <p>Clinical Experiences Survey (Courses – ATTR 755, 756, 855, 856)</p> <p>Exit Survey</p>	<p>80% of students score an 80% or higher on these practice-based research project assignments</p> <p>80% of students score an 80% or higher on these Moot Court assignments</p> <p>Students ratings average 3.5/5 or better for integrating quality improvement into their practice</p> <p>Students are able to integrate quality improvement at least 80% of the time in their patient care. Students rate themselves at an average or 3.5/5 or better for their effectiveness in integrating quality improvement into their practice.</p> <p>80% of students score that the program prepared them to integrate quality improvement into practice at 3.5/5 or better</p>	<p>End of the Semester Goal Reflection and Action Plan – 78% of students scored 80% or higher (avg 83%) in ATTR 756</p> <p>End of the Semester Goal Reflection and Action Plan – 86% of students scored 80% or higher (avg 85%) in ATTR 855</p> <p>Goal Setting and Reflection – 92% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=86%) in ATTR 856</p> <p>Proposal – 92% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=90%)</p> <p>Data Collection – 95% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=96%)</p> <p>Manuscript – 88% of students achieved an 80% or higher (avg=85%)</p> <p>83% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=84%)</p> <p>Students were rated as “good” (avg=4.4/5) for integrating quality improvement into their practice</p> <p>Students integrate quality improvement care into their practice 60% of the time and rate themselves as “very effective” (avg=3.5/5).</p> <p>70.8% of students scored that the program was “very effective” and 29.2% of students scored the program was “effective” at</p>	<p>distinction for the program and reflect upon specific courses and professional development activities that added value to their clinical practice. The first year DAT students are required to complete a series of comprehensive examinations directly related to the prompts in the PDP template. After reading their comprehensive exam responses and the feedback provided by the faculty, the students had to develop one goal per question. The aim of this assignment is for students to achieve these goals throughout the program, not just in one semester. The program also requires the student to complete a mid-semester and end-of-semester review of their PDP plan related to goal implementation and effectiveness. The reviews allow the student to consider how and what they most need to focus on, reframe their goals, and implement continuous quality improvement on an individual level.</p> <p>The individualized PDP allows the student to include the core competencies and points of distinction throughout their clinical education experiences regardless of their employment status or location. The goal of the comprehensive exams and guided PDP plan is to make the clinical education experience individualistic, yet approaching</p>
---	--	--	---	--

	<p>Alumni Survey</p> <p>Employer Survey</p>	<p>80% of alumni score that the program prepared them to integrate quality improvement into practice at 3.5/5 or better</p> <p>80% of employers score that the program prepared them to integrate quality improvement into practice at 3.5/5 or better</p>	<p>preparing them to integrate quality improvement into their practice (avg=4.71)</p> <p>52.4% of students scored that the program was “very effective” and 42.9% of students scored the program was “effective” at preparing them to integrate quality improvement into their practice (avg=4.48)</p> <p>Unable to assess at this time.</p>	<p>the larger benchmarks of the DAT program.</p> <p>Data from the exit and alumni surveys indicate that graduates believe the program was effective at preparing them to integrate quality improvement into their practice.</p> <p>No actions will be taken, relative to this core competency, at this time.</p>
<p><i>Healthcare Informatics –</i> Students will demonstrate the ability to integrate healthcare informatics skills into clinical practice.</p> <p>Specific Learning Objectives – Students will demonstrate the ability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– To search, retrieve, and utilize information derived from online databases and/or internal databases for clinical decision support</li> <li>– To properly protect the security of personal health information in a manner that is consistent with legal and ethical considerations for use of such data</li> <li>– To guide patients to online sources of reliable health-related information</li> <li>– To utilize word processing, presentation, and data analysis software</li> <li>– To communicate through email, text messaging, listservs, and emerging modes of interactive electronic information transfer</li> </ul> <p>Aligns with G5 Graduate Student Learning Goals.</p>	<p><b><u>Assignments and Measures:</u></b></p> <p>CIH Infographic (Courses – ATTR 710)</p> <p>Data Analysis Project (Courses – ATTR 713)</p> <p>Healthcare Informatics and Practice Analysis Assignment (Courses – ATTR 756)</p> <p>Telemedicine Project (Courses – ATTR 847)</p> <p>Clinical Site Supervisor Evaluations (Courses – ATTR 755, 756, 855, 856)</p> <p>Clinical Experiences Survey (Courses – ATTR 755, 756, 855, 856)</p>	<p>80% of students score an 80% or higher on the infographic assignment</p> <p>80% of students score an 80% or higher on the infographic assignment</p> <p>80% of students score an 80% or higher on the Healthcare Informatics and Practice Analysis Assignment</p> <p>80% of students score an 80% or higher on the Telemedicine Project</p> <p>Students ratings average 3.5/5 or better for integrating healthcare informatics into their practice</p> <p>Students are able to integrate healthcare informatics at least 80% of the time in their patient care. Students rate themselves at an average or 3.5/5 or better for their effectiveness in</p>	<p>100% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=97%)</p> <p>68% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=84.4%)</p> <p>95% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=95%)</p> <p>97% of students score an 90% or higher (avg=94%)</p> <p>Students were rated as “exceptional” (avg=4.5/5) for integrating healthcare informatics into their practice</p> <p>Students integrate healthcare informatics into their practice 74% of the time and rate themselves as “very effective” (avg=3.7/5).</p>	<p>Overall data indicate that the program is meeting its learning objectives relative to healthcare informatics. However, during program debriefing sessions and in consultation with core faculty facilitating research projects we have learned that students do not feel well equipped to use data analysis software as they engage in the quality improvement project(s). We are currently in consultation with the faculty who teach AHS 604 (Johnson and Fern-Kuo) to enhance the students’ independence in analyzing their own data without faculty direct faculty supervision. Although there are no program outcomes attached to this course, they enhance the preparedness for students to be successful in their traditional and practice-based research projects. A meeting with Dr. Johnson and Dr. Fern-Kuo is scheduled for June 2019. We have also added a course</p>

	<p>Exit Survey</p> <p>Alumni Survey</p> <p>Employer Survey</p>	<p>integrating healthcare informatics into their practice.</p> <p>80% of students score that the program prepared them to integrate healthcare informatics into practice at 3.5/5 or better</p> <p>80% of alumni score that the program prepared them to integrate healthcare informatics into practice at 3.5/5 or better</p> <p>80% of employers score that the program prepared them to integrate healthcare informatics into practice at 3.5/5 or better</p>	<p>66.7% of students scored that the program was “very effective” and 29.2% of students scored the program was “effective” at preparing them to integrate healthcare informatics into their practice (avg=4.63)</p> <p>33.3% of students scored that the program was “very effective” and 61.9% of students scored the program was “effective” at preparing them to integrate healthcare informatics into their practice (avg=4.29)</p> <p>Unable to assess at this time.</p>	<p>ATTR 871 Healthcare Informatics, which will be offered for the first time in Summer 2019. This course is intended to specifically address the students’ ability to analyze outcomes data to draw conclusions for systems level decision making in their clinical practice. Data from the exit and alumni surveys indicate that graduates believe the program was effective at preparing them to integrate healthcare informatics into their practice.</p> <p>The course instructor will be asked to provide assignment descriptions and data analysis for ATTR 871 at the end of the summer session. Core faculty, affiliate faculty, and PHD students will discuss the findings during our August Strategic Planning Meeting.</p>
<p><i>Professionalism</i> – Students will demonstrate honesty, reliability, accountability, patience, modesty, and self-control.</p> <p>Specific Learning Objectives – Students will demonstrate the ability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– To adhere to the NATA Code of Ethics</li> <li>– To adhere to the BOC Standards of Professional Practice</li> </ul> <p>Aligns with G3 Graduate Student Learning Goals.</p>	<p><b><u>Assignments and Measures:</u></b></p> <p>Presentations (Courses – ATTR 710, 725, 811)</p> <p>Resume/Cover Letter/Mock Interviews (Courses – ATTR 726)</p> <p>Legal Issues Paper (Courses – ATTR 726)</p>	<p>Students score an 80% or higher on presentations related to professionalism</p> <p>Students score an 80% or higher on the assignments related to the Mock Interviews</p> <p>Students score an 80% or higher on the Legal Issues Paper</p>	<p>CIH Demonstration – 96% of students scored 80% or higher (avg=88%) ATTR 710</p> <p>Teaching Presentations – 96% of students scored 80% or higher (avg=90%) ATTR 725</p> <p>Creative Instruction – 96% of students scored 80% or higher (avg=90%) ATTR 725</p> <p>TEDxAT Big Ideas in AT – 100% of students scored 80% or higher (avg= 88%)</p> <p>88% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=95%)</p> <p>75% of students scored an 80%</p>	<p>Overall data indicate that the program is meeting its learning objectives relative to professionalism. Student performance throughout the program indicates that students are able to present information effectively, and in alignment with regulatory bodies in athletic training. In addition, students engage in professional preparation activities, as they consider future employment opportunities. They are also engaged in the analysis of regulation and legislation that govern athletic training practice. Data from the exit and alumni surveys indicate that graduates</p>



	<p>Clinical Site Supervisor Evaluations (Courses – ATTR 755, 756, 855, 856)</p> <p>Clinical Experiences Survey (Courses – ATTR 755, 756, 855, 856)</p> <p>Exit Survey</p> <p>Alumni Survey</p> <p>Employer Survey</p>	<p>Students ratings average 3.5/5 or better for integrating professionalism into their practice</p> <p>Students are able to integrate professionalism at least 80% of the time in their patient care. Students rate themselves at an average or 3.5/5 or better for their effectiveness in integrating professionalism into their practice.</p> <p>80% of students score that the program prepared them to integrate professionalism into practice at 3.5/5 or better</p> <p>80% of alumni score that the program prepared them to integrate professionalism into practice at 3.5/5 or better</p> <p>80% of employers score that the program prepared them to integrate professionalism into practice at 3.5/5 or better</p>	<p>or higher (avg=86%)</p> <p>Students were rated as “exceptional” (avg=4.8/5) for integrating professionalism into their practice</p> <p>Students integrate professionalism into their practice 90% of the time and rate themselves as “very effective” (avg=4.1/5).</p> <p>70.8% of students scored that the program was “very effective” and 29.2% of students scored the program was “effective” at preparing them to integrate quality improvement into their practice (avg=4.71)</p> <p>61.9% of students scored that the program was “very effective” and 38.1% of students scored the program was “effective” at preparing them to integrate quality improvement into their practice (avg=4.62)</p> <p>Unable to assess at this time.</p>	<p>believe the program was effective at preparing them to integrate professionalism into their practice.</p> <p>No actions will be taken, relative to this core competency, at this time.</p>
<p><i>Advocacy, Education, and Leadership</i> – Students will demonstrate advocacy, educational, and leadership skills for the advancement of the profession.</p> <p>Specific Learning Objectives – Students will demonstrate the ability:</p>	<p><b><u>Assignments and Measures:</u></b> Lesson Plans (Courses – ATTR 725, 720)</p>	<p>Students score an average of 80% on each lesson plan activity</p>	<p>Lesson Plan 1 – 100% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=90%) Lesson Plan 2 – 100% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=92%) Lesson Plan 3 – 84% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=86%)</p>	<p>Overall data indicate that the program is meeting its learning objectives relative to advocacy, education, and leadership. Data from the Education Project offered in ATTR 756 indicates only 55% of students are meeting the expectations, but the average score is high. In</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Advocate for the advancement of athletic training</li> <li>- Apply the principles of scientific research to identify a problem, search the literature, formulate a research question, develop a hypothesis grounded in the literature, choose an appropriate design to answer the research question, and justify the process by which you applied these principles</li> <li>- Synthesize instructional theory and practice principles to effectively instruct patients, students, peers, collaborators, and supervisors</li> <li>- Synthesize leadership and management theory and practice principles to effectively lead others</li> </ul>	<p>Simulation Project (Courses – ATTR 725)</p> <p>Stakeholder Advocacy Project (Courses – ATTR 756)</p> <p>Colleague, Peer, Student, or Patient Education Project (Courses – ATTR 756)</p> <p>Leadership/Advocacy Project (Courses – ATTR 726)</p> <p>Leadership Book (Courses – ATTR 856)</p> <p>Clinical Site Supervisor Evaluations (Courses – ATTR 755, 756, 855, 856)</p> <p>Exit Survey</p>	<p>Students score an 80% or higher on the Simulation Project</p> <p>80% of students score an 80% or higher on the Stakeholder Advocacy Project</p> <p>80% of students score an 80% or higher on the Education Project</p> <p>80% of students score an 80% or higher on the Leadership/Advocacy Project</p> <p>80% of students score an 80% or higher on the Leadership Book</p> <p>Students ratings average 3.5/5 or better for integrating professionalism into their practice</p> <p>80% of students score that the program prepared them to integrate advocacy, education, and leadership into practice at 3.5/5 or better</p>	<p>Lesson Plan 4 – 100% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=93%)</p> <p>Lesson Plan 5 – 91% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=92%)</p> <p>100% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=85%)</p> <p>78% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=88%)</p> <p>55% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=88%)</p> <p>83% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=93%)</p> <p>100% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=100%)</p> <p>Students were rated as “exceptional” (avg=4.6/5) for integrating education into their practice; Students were rated as “exceptional” (avg=4.47/5) for integrating leadership into their practice</p> <p>79.2% of students scored that the program was “very effective” at preparing them to integrate advocacy into their practice (avg=4.71); 83.3% of students scored that the program was “very effective” at preparing them to integrate education into their practice (avg=4.83); 79.2%</p>	<p>consultation with the course instructor, we identified that several students failed to collect educational outcomes data for the project, resulting in poor scores. Data from the exit and alumni surveys indicate that graduates believe the program was effective at preparing them to integrate advocacy, education, and leadership into their practice.</p> <p>During the August Strategic Planning Meeting, the core faculty, affiliate faculty, and PHD students will discuss a process that will strengthen the infrastructure of the Education Project.</p>
<p>Aligns with G2 Graduate Student Learning Goals.</p>				



<p>while maintain a whole-body approach to healthcare</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Demonstrate the ability to perform a comprehensive and systematic injury evaluation for the lower extremity and spine, while maintain a whole-body approach to healthcare</li> <li>– Demonstrate the ability to perform a comprehensive and systematic injury evaluation for the upper extremity, head, and neck, while maintain a whole-body approach to healthcare</li> <li>– Integrate skills of prevention, recognition, and treatment into comprehensive whole-body healthcare</li> </ul> <p>Aligns with G4 and G5 Graduate Student Learning Goals.</p>	<p>Patient Plan of Care (Courses – ATTR 720)</p> <p>Whole Body Wellness Protection Project (Courses – ATTR 830)</p> <p>Patient Case Presentation and Treatment Plan (Courses – ATTR 820)</p> <p>Clinical Site Supervisor Evaluations (Courses – ATTR 755, 756, 855, 856)</p> <p>Exit Survey</p> <p>Alumni Survey</p> <p>Employer Survey</p>	<p>80% of students score an 80% or higher on the Patient Plan of Care</p> <p>80% of students score an 80% or higher on the Whole Body Wellness Protection Project</p> <p>80% of students score an 80% or higher on the Patient Case Presentation and Treatment Plan</p> <p>Students ratings average 3.5/5 or better for integrating an integrative approach to healthcare into their practice</p> <p>80% of students score that the program prepared them to integrate an integrative approach to healthcare into practice at 3.5/5 or better</p> <p>80% of alumni score that the program prepared them to integrate an integrative approach to healthcare into practice at 3.5/5 or better</p> <p>80% of employers score that the program prepared them to integrate an integrative approach to healthcare into practice at 3.5/5 or better</p>	<p>92% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=93%)</p> <p>100% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=94%)</p> <p>63% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=81%)</p> <p>Students were rated as “exceptional” (avg=4.6/5) for integrating an integrative approach to healthcare into their practice</p> <p>62.5% of students scored that the program was “very effective” and 37.5% of students scored the program was “effective” at preparing them to integrate an integrative approach to healthcare into their practice (avg=4.63)</p> <p>52.4% of students scored that the program was “very effective” and 47.6% of students scored the program was “effective” at preparing them to integrate an integrative approach to healthcare into their practice (avg=4.52)</p> <p>Unable to assess at this time.</p>	<p>all aspects of a patient. They then use compressive evaluation concepts to evaluate a mock patient and then develop an integrative health care plan based on findings.</p> <p>During the August Strategic Planning Meeting, the core faculty, affiliate faculty, and PHD students will discuss a process that will strengthen the infrastructure of these projects. Specifically, the course instructor believes that peer review processes may improve the outcomes with this assignment.</p> <p>Based on student feedback in debriefing sessions, the Patient Education/Home Care Project will be replaced with a Disablement Model Case Study. Specifically, students have indicated an inability to apply the ICF model in a practical sense. Introduction and practice of this learning outcome in the foundational course (ATTR 710) may enhance this concept earlier in the program.</p> <p>Data from the exit and alumni surveys indicate that graduates believe the program was effective at preparing them to integrate integrative health care into their practice.</p>
<p><i>Clinical and Patient Outcomes – Students will demonstrate the ability to measure and evaluate individual and systems level</i></p>	<p><b>Assignments and Measures:</b> Outcomes Tools Assessment (Courses – ATTR 713)</p>	<p>80% of students score an 80% or higher on the Outcomes Tools Assessment</p>	<p>96% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=90%)</p>	<p>Overall data indicate that the program is meeting its learning objectives relative to clinical and</p>

<p>clinical practice with the aim of contributing to the professional body of knowledge.</p> <p>Specific Learning Objectives – Students will demonstrate the ability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Select appropriate clinical and patient outcome measures to effectively measure disease and patient oriented evidence</li> <li>- Collect, analyze, and interpret patient information with the objective of improving the quality of your patient care</li> </ul> <p>Aligns with G4 and G5 Graduate Student Learning Goals.</p>	<p>Outcomes Implementation Plan (Courses – ATTR 713)</p> <p>CAM/Integrative Health Implementation (Courses – ATTR 755)</p> <p>Measurement Implementation Project (Courses – ATTR 755)</p> <p>Short Term Effects (Courses – ATTR 840)</p> <p>Patient Portfolio (Courses – ATTR 840)</p> <p>Clinical Site Supervisor Evaluations (Courses – ATTR 755, 756, 855, 856)</p> <p>Exit Survey</p> <p>Alumni Survey</p> <p>Employer Survey</p>	<p>80% of students score an 80% or higher on the Implementation Plan</p> <p>80% of students score an 80% or higher on the CAM/Integrative Health Implementation</p> <p>80% of students score an 80% or higher on the Measurement Implementation Project</p> <p>80% of students score an 80% or higher on the Short Term Effects</p> <p>80% of students score an 80% or higher on the Patient Portfolio</p> <p>Students ratings average 3.5/5 or better for integrating clinical and patient outcomes into their practice</p> <p>80% of students score that the program prepared them to integrate clinical and patient outcomes into practice at 3.5/5 or better</p> <p>80% of alumni score that the program prepared them to integrate clinical and patient outcomes into practice at 3.5/5 or better</p> <p>80% of employers score that the program prepared them to integrate clinical and patient</p>	<p>54% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=80%)</p> <p>100% of students scored 80% or higher (avg=91.8%)</p> <p>82% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=86%)</p> <p>96% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=86%)</p> <p>58% of students scored an 80% or higher (avg=77%)</p> <p>Students were rated as “exceptional” (avg=4.5/5) for integrating clinical and patient outcomes into their practice</p> <p>62.5% of students scored that the program was “very effective” and 37.5% of students scored the program was “effective” at preparing them to integrate an integrative approach to healthcare into their practice (avg=4.63)</p> <p>57.4% of students scored that the program was “very effective” and 38.1% of students scored the program was “effective” at preparing them to integrate an integrative approach to healthcare into their practice (avg=4.52)</p> <p>Unable to assess at this time.</p>	<p>patient outcomes. The Outcomes Implementation Plan assignment is offered in the first semester of the program. Based on consultation with the instructor, many students struggled with the oral presentation component of this assignment, while others handed in the assignment late. In review of previous year’s data, there was a substantial decrease in student performance on this assignment. As previously stated, students are often poorly prepared to do presentations in the first semester of the program.</p> <p>The Patient Portfolio assignment is a culminating assignment that requires students to implement manual therapy skills into their clinical practice and to measure their outcomes. Students may require more prompting to be successful with this project.</p> <p>Data from the exit and alumni surveys indicate that graduates believe the program was effective at preparing them to integrate clinical and patient outcomes into their practice.</p> <p>During the August Strategic Planning Meeting, the core faculty, affiliate faculty, and PHD students will discuss a process that will strengthen the infrastructure of the Outcomes Implementation Plan and the Patient Portfolio.</p>
---	---	---	--	---

		outcomes into practice at 3.5/5 or better		
--	--	---	--	--

Note: If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit "tab" to add a new row.

Helpful Hints for Completing this Table

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference. Note any alignment with professional standards, as applicable.
- b. Each outcome should be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam should be included as one of the measures. At least one of the program's outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses. Describe or attach any evaluation tools such as rubrics, scales, etc.
- c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of "3" to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.)
- d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., 85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark).

**Part 1b: Review of Student Success Data & Activities**

Use [Blue Reports](#) to generate the following information (as well as any other information helpful to you):

- 1) Cohort Sizes
- 2) Year-to-Year Retention
- 3) 5-Year Graduation Rate

The program is meeting its goals relative to graduation, retention, professional advancement or placement (employment), and instructor effectiveness. These data are consistent with the 3-year aggregate and are improvements from the Class of 2018.

What worked well in supporting student success this year?

Analysis of programmatic data has revealed an oversight in the program's entrance survey, which was corrected prior to the program start for the Class of 2021 (June 10, 2019). This change will allowed us to improve our measurements of advancing student's depth and breadth of understanding of contemporary athletic training skills, the core competencies, and the program's points of distinction.

What are the most significant opportunities for improvement upon which to focus in the coming year?

The program discussed, during its September Strategic Planning Meeting, a better method for measuring publications presentations. This measurement is currently calculated as an n (total sum), but may be more informative to set a benchmark for percent engagement of the total number of students in the program. The program also discussed opportunities to improve sequencing and advancement of courses.

Addition summery data following program outcomes can be found at: <https://www.indstate.edu/health/doctorate-athletic-training-assessment>

<b>a. What goals/objectives were established this past year to aid student performance, retention, persistence, and completion?</b>	<b>b. What primary action steps were taken to make progress on each goal and who was responsible?</b>	<b>c. What data informs progress on each goal?</b>	<b>d. What were some accomplishments or achievements for each goal and/or challenges confronted?</b>	<b>e. Please indicate goals that are continuing and any goals that will replace a previous goal. Any additional goals</b>
---	---	--	--	---

				<b>can also be added on a new line.</b>
Graduation rate – 75% students will graduate from the program	All students have a program of study.  This is maintained by the Program Director.	Graduation rate calculation.	23 of 26 students completed the program (88.5%).	Continuing (required by CAATE accreditation).
Program retention rate – 75% of students will be retained from the end of Summer 1 to the end of Summer 2	Students placed on academic probation have individualized remediation plans and meet with academic advisors regularly.  New policies were implemented for the incoming Class of 2020 to require continued progress toward a 3.0 GPA. Students are expected to graduate with a 3.0 GPA.  These policies and action steps are maintained by the Program Director and faculty advisors.	Retention rate calculation.	24 of 26 students were retained from Summer 1 to Summer 2 (92.3%).	Continuing (required by CAATE accreditation).
Professional advancement or placement – 100% of graduates in full-time employment will meet their personal or professional goals stated at the onset of the program and 100% of graduates in part-time employment will gain full-time employment upon program completion.  Students will indicate significant improvements in contemporary athletic training skills, the core	Career readiness activities integrated into ATTR 726 (resume building, interviewing, feedback, negotiating, etc.). The course instructor is responsible for this learning activity.  Program faculty also serve as references and provide professional mentoring.  Data collection is continuous and ongoing.	Program faculty remain in contact with graduates to determine employment status, change in title/pay.  Program faculty calculate changes from the entrance	Students who entered the program with full-time employment – 6 of 6 students (100%) perceive their employment goals have been met by enrollment in the DAT  Students who entered the program with part-time employment – 13 of 17 students (76.4%) have been placed in full-time Athletic Training positions aligned with their professional goals	Continuing (required by CAATE accreditation).  Continuing. Analysis has identified areas to improve the entrance and exit surveys. Specifically, the entrance survey is missing the construct “advocacy”, which needs to be added for the entrance of the incoming class before June 10, 2019.

<p>competencies and the program's points of distinction.</p>		<p>and exit survey to inform student confidence and integration of contemporary athletic training skills, the core competencies, and the program's points of distinction.</p>	<p>Evidence-based clinical practice +28% (t29=-6.040, p&lt;0.001)</p> <p>Prevention and health promotion +14% (t29=-3.597, p=0.001)</p> <p>Clinical examination and diagnosis +10% (t29=-3.751, p=0.001)</p> <p>Acute care of injury and illness +10% (t29=-3.067, p=0.005)</p> <p>Therapeutic interventions +16% (t29=-4.428, p&lt;0.001)</p> <p>Psychosocial strategies and referral +23% (t29=-4.447, p&lt;0.001)</p> <p>Healthcare administration +23% (t29=-5.013, p&lt;0.001)</p> <p>Patient-centered care +27% (t35=-7.554, p&lt;0.001)</p> <p>Interprofessional and collaborative practice +21% (t35=-5.676, p&lt;0.001)</p> <p>Evidence-based practice +28% (t35=-7.678, p&lt;0.001)</p>	
--	--	---	---	--



			<p>Quality improvement +35% (t<sub>35</sub>=-10.935, p&lt;0.001)</p> <p>Healthcare informatics +36% (t<sub>35</sub>=-7.282, p&lt;0.001)</p> <p>Professionalism +9% (t<sub>35</sub>=-3.630, p=0.001)</p> <p>Education +22% (t<sub>35</sub>=-7.172, p&lt;0.001)</p> <p>Leadership +23% (t<sub>35</sub>=-6.343, p&lt;0.001)</p> <p>Integrative approach to providing healthcare +27% (t<sub>35</sub>=-6.228, p&lt;0.001)</p> <p>Measuring outcomes +36% (t<sub>35</sub>=-8.537, p&lt;0.001)</p>	
<p>Publications and Presentations – Students are engaged in the dissemination of their scholarly work.</p> <p><b>Research and Professional Publications</b> – We aim to have 12 publications related to student and faculty collaborations annually</p> <p><b>Presentations</b> – We aim to have 20 local, district, national, or international presentations related to</p>	Data collection is continuous and ongoing.	Publications and presentations are documented and maintained on the NICER Lab website and through the program’s social media accounts.	<p><b><i>3 year aggregate: student and faculty collaborations have resulted in 47 published or accepted manuscripts; 16 collaborations are in review; 10 collaborations are in process (16.7 publications per year)</i></b></p> <p>Class of 2019 – 12 student/faculty collaborations have been published or are accepted for publication; 15 collaborations are in review; 7 collaboration is in process</p> <p><b><i>3 year aggregate: student and faculty collaborations have resulted in 69 published</i></b></p>	Continuing. During the August Strategic Planning Meeting, we will discuss adjusting the benchmarking for this program goal.

student and faculty collaborations annually			<b>or accepted manuscripts (21 presentations per year)</b>  Class of 2019 – 21 student/faculty collaborations have been presented	
Instructor effectiveness – Faculty course ratings will exceed a 3.5/5 on a continuing basis.	Faculty are in regular communication about course instruction.	Instructor evaluations are maintained through the University.	3-year aggregate data suggests that all core and affiliate faculty are meeting or exceeding this program goal. Aggregate course ratings indicate students are satisfied with course instruction (avg=4.52)	Continuing. We have discussed engaging in professional development relative to distance education in AY19-20.

### **Part 1c: Summary of Career Readiness Activities (OPTIONAL FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS)**

Please submit your Career Readiness Competencies curriculum map along with this report as a separate attachment. The template was sent to you with this form via email. It is not expected that every course in your curriculum correspond to a career readiness competency.

**See Career Readiness Tracking Form.**

### **Part 2: Continuous Quality Improvement**

**Reflect on the information shared above regarding student learning, success, and career readiness. In no more than one page, summarize:**

The program meets annually to analyze data to determine the extent to which the program meets its mission, goals, and objectives. The team downloads and analyzes relevant data relative to the course assignments, scholarly experiences, advanced clinical practice experiences, exit surveys, alumni surveys, employer surveys, course instructor evaluations, and program retention, completion, employment, and dissemination data to determine program effectiveness. The data is discussed and an action plan is developed.

This year, program faculty and doctoral fellows met on Tuesday September 6th and all stakeholders of the program have been given access to programmatic assessment data for review. Additionally stakeholders will be advised of changes as they are implemented in the curriculum.

***Please prepare this report as a Word document. Do not include any attachments. Instead, provide links to important supporting materials (e.g., detailed—but not student-specific—assessment results; rubrics; minutes; etc.), or upload them to the college’s assessment site in Blackboard.***

Dear Lindsey,

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2018-19 with the Assessment Council. You will find feedback and ratings on the rubric below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but were not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment in your program.

This report will be shared with the Associate Dean(s) and Dean of your college and summarized findings will be shared as composite college/institutional data with the President's Office and the Provost's team.

Sincerely,

Kelley (x7975)

<b>Program: D.A.T. Athletic Training</b>	<b>Overall Rating: Mature (2.75/3.00)</b>
<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Learning outcomes are clear, specific, and measurable. They are aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcomes.</li><li>• Courses and assignments used as assessment measures are described in detail. Multiple measures are used for assessment of each outcome and combine direct and indirect measures for a variety of perspectives on student learning.</li><li>• Expected and actual student performance is clearly described.</li><li>• Analysis of data goes into great detail to describe overall performance, pinpoint areas for improvement, and, when applicable, suggest actionable plans for adjusting assignments, content, delivery, and/or student support to improve student learning.</li><li>• Faculty are clearly very involved in all parts of teaching and assessment.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Consider noting alignment to accreditor standards to ease the use of this report in accreditation reporting.</li><li>• For measures where evaluative methods aren't clear (projects, papers, and the like), make a note of how performance was evaluated (e.g., rubric, checklist, etc.). This is helpful for understanding how the breadth of outcomes for each measure are assessed within specific assignments.</li></ul>

Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary	Mature	Developing	Undeveloped
<p><b>Student Learning Outcomes</b></p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) directly link to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcomes(s) is measurable.</p>	<p>No learning outcomes are identified for assessment or the outcomes that are identified are not linked to program outcomes aligned with program coursework (e.g. – curriculum map) or are not measurable.</p>
<p><b>Performance Goals &amp; Measures</b></p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools used to measure student performance are described and were reviewed for validity or trustworthiness prior to use (note this in the report; attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are described (attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal(s) is identified for each learning outcome.</p> <p>Identified measures (ex: assignments, projects, tests, etc.) are poorly suited to performance goals or are solely indirect measures.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are not described. (some)</p>	<p>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes is identified, and/or no measures are provided.</p>

<b>Analysis &amp; Results</b>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of quality analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p> <p>Results are discussed in relation to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with little description of analysis.</p>	<p>No data is being collected.</p> <p>No results are provided.</p>
<b>Sharing &amp; Use of Results for Continuous Improvement</b>	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>A plan for adjusting performance, goals, assessment, and/or program components based on results is outlined.</p>	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p>	<p>Limited information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Some discussion of what was learned from results is provided.</p>	<p>No information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>No evidence of reflection on results is provided (ex: discussion, conclusions drawn)</p>
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped