

Student Learning Summary Form AY2015-16

Due to your dean by June 1

Due from dean to assessment office by June 15

Degree Program Name: _____ **Doctorate of Health Sciences_** **Contact Name and Email:** **Matthew Hutchins** matt.hutchins@indstate.edu _

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary.

Part One

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, indicate the Graduate Student Learning Outcome* each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. (1) What method(s) did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</p>	<p>c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual results?</p>	<p>e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program’s faculty?</p>
<p>1. Leadership GSLO- Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies GSLO- Students engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments GSLO- Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession GSLO- Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession</p>	<p>Health Program Proposal in AHS 617</p> <p>Final Internship Product in AHS 821/822</p> <p>Facilitated Discussion Leader in AHS 815</p>	<p>80% of students complete project(s) with a B or better</p>	<p>All doctoral students (16/16) scored better than 80% on the health program proposal and facilitated discussion leader assignments.</p> <p>20/21 of the student internships (over the last 3 years) were completed with a B or better. One student failed an AHS 821 internship experience and did not submit a final product.</p>	<p>The faculty of record for each course (Hutchins) was responsible for collecting and submitting the data to the Graduate Program Director (Hutchins). A summarized report of the data was given to AHS faculty via email and discussed in a Health Sciences program meeting.</p>
<p>2. Professionalism GSLO- Students engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments GSLO- Students achieve</p>	<p>Final Internship Product (evaluations from site supervisor) in AHS 821/822</p>	<p>80% of students meet or exceed expectations in all 17 categories listed on the evaluation form</p>	<p>16/17 internship experiences evaluated with the currently adopted form were completed with ‘meets or exceeds expectations’ in all categories on the evaluation form. One student failed an</p>	<p>The faculty of record for each course (Hutchins) was responsible for collecting and submitting the data to the Graduate Program Director (Hutchins). A summarized report of the data was given</p>

mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession GSLO- Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession			AHS 821 internship experience, in part by not having the site supervisor complete and submit the specified paperwork	to AHS faculty via email and discussed in a Health Sciences program meeting.
3.Systems Thinking GSLO- Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies GSLO-Students recognize and act on professional and ethical challenges that arise in their field or discipline GSLO- Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession	Student Presentation and Interview Summary in AHS 812	80% of students complete assignment with a B or better	8/9 completed the summary and presentation with a B or better. One student received a B- on the written summary portion of the assignment.	The faculty of record for each course (Hutchins) was responsible for collecting and submitting the data to the Graduate Program Director (Hutchins). A summarized report of the data was given to AHS faculty via email and discussed in a Health Sciences program meeting.

* See <https://www2.indstate.edu/graduate/forms/review.pdf>.

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.

Notes

- Use your outcomes library as a reference.
- Each outcome must 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 must be included as one of the measures. At least one of the outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses.
- 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.”
- 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).
- This may be a specific individual, a position (e.g., assessment coordinator), or a group such as the department assessment committee. Minutes should reflect that results are shared with members of the department at least annually.

Part Two

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students’ learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself; 2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator’s feedback on the previous summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

If you would like to reference any supporting materials (departmental meeting minutes, detailed assessment results, etc.), please provide the URL at which they can be found.

In 2015-16, the department collected data on three assessment pieces. These included three assessments of leadership, one assessment of professionalism, and two assessments of systems thinking. Faculty members expect that at least 80% of the students will complete the assessments/projects with scores of B or better and that students will receive meeting or exceeding expectations rankings in all categories on the internship evaluation form. As the chart above shows, almost all students meet the benchmarks set forth by the faculty.

- Health Program Proposal: All of the doctoral students met the expectation of B or better. Some students are better at certain parts of the proposal. Areas that stand out as needing improvement are the ability to synthesize information from various sources and the ability to critically think about their own ideas for proposed interventions. Continuing to refine assignments leading up to this and to clarify the assignment description have enhanced the quality of these proposals
- Final Internship Product: To date, doctoral students have completed 21 internship experiences across the 3 cohorts. The experience is much clearer in terms of expectations from the student and the site as compared to the first few internship experiences. We now have a detailed syllabi and matching agreement forms for all of our graduate students completing the internship experience. I believe the new Career Center requirements will also serve to strengthen and these experiences and keep them as uniform as possible. One student did fail an internship experience by not completing the required assignments.
- Facilitated Discussion Leader: Over the past three years, 16/16 students have completed the assignment with a B or better. One area that many can improve on is the ability to facilitate the discussion and build from what others share. The tendency in the beginning is for the student to want to lecture and tell; not facilitate discussion. This tendency decreases as the instructors continue to model facilitating behavior and provide examples of good discussion leaders.
- Final Internship Evaluations from Site Supervisors: The uniformed version of this has been in place for two years now and the positive feedback I get is fantastic. Instead of searching for sites and asking if I can send a student, I have sites tell me that they are impressed with student ability, knowledge, motivation, attitude and professionalism. Many sites even tell me to send more students their way. One key to this positive experience, I think, is in the approach with the supervisors. Expectations for them and for the student are clearly set before the student is allowed to register for the course and the instructor maintains appropriate contact with all supervisors via email and phone multiple times during the semester prior to the final evaluation.
- Student Presentation and Interview Assignment: Eight of nine completed the assignment with a B or better. One student received a B- on the written portion of the assignment primarily because length was insufficient and there were grammatical errors.

The department is scheduled to begin a new assessment cycle for the 2016-17 year. It is hoped that data from upcoming years can be compared to the past 3-year data cycle. At this time there are no plans to add any new assessments, but there may be discussion around whether or not to move the faculty expectation from a B to a B+ or that 90% of students receive a B or better. As accreditation efforts for health sciences programs begin, the assessment plan may need to change to reflect revised standards from the accrediting body.

Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University

Degree Program: Doctorate of Health Sciences Date: 7.28.16

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No outcomes are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific and measurable. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are student-centered. <input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. <input type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered program outcomes that span multiple learning domains. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). <input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. <input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were

				assessed in this cycle.
<p>2. Measures & Performance Goals</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.	<input type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct. <input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified. <input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course. <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided that demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what students know/can do.

				<input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.
3. Results	<input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected. <input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process. <input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	<input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected. <input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being analyzed. <input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. <input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are provided. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	<input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the assessment process. <input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well. <input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.
4. Engagement & Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. <input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. <input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not clear and/or do not clearly connect to the results.	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty. <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement.	<input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important

	plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	<p>stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement.</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 0 – Undeveloped	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 1 - Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 2 – Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 – Exemplary		

COMMENTS

Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

1. Learning Outcomes

No learning outcomes are included in the report, only the general category of the over-arching objective (e.g., leadership, professionalism). Please be sure to identify the specific outcomes that were assessed.

2. Measures & Performance Goals

Five discrete methods are used to assess the program's learning outcomes, including high-impact practices such as an internship. But more information is needed to demonstrate a clear connection between the outcomes and the methods. For example, what is the final internship product? What must a facilitated discussion leader do?

3. Results

Students met all standards, suggesting both that they're doing well and that as you note, it may be time to raise the bar. But what did you learn, specifically, about what students know and can do/don't know and can't do, as a result of conducting these assessments? You have a detailed evaluation form for the internship (which you should provide a link to in your next report). What about the other assignments?

4. Engagement & Improvement

One faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing the data. Is there opportunity to broaden participation, or is participation dictated by teaching assignments? Part Two offers a good, general discussion of weaknesses that have been identified, addressed, and ameliorated, outcome by outcome. Thanks!