

**Student Learning Summary Form AY2016-17**

**Due to your dean by June 1**

**Due from dean to assessment office by June 15**

**Degree Program Name:** B.S./M.S. in Athletic Training **Contact Name and Email:** Kirk Armstrong, [kirk.armstrong@indstate.edu](mailto:kirk.armstrong@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><b>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?</b></p> <p>If this is a graduate program, indicate the <a href="#">Graduate Student Learning Outcome*</a> each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p><b>c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?</b></p>	<p><b>d. What were the actual results?</b></p>	<p><b>e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?</b></p>
<p>Utilize evidence-based techniques to perform patient-centered clinical examinations based on relevant pathology</p> <p>(Alignment to Program Outcome #2; Graduate Outcomes #3, #4, #5)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preceptor Evaluation of Student (ATTR 455/456, ATTR 355/356, ATTR 255/256, ATTR 601/602)</li> <li>2. Knee Standardized Patient Encounter (ATTR 256)</li> <li>3. Knee Oral Practical Examination (ATTR 256)</li> <li>4. Shoulder Practical Examination (ATTR 365L, ATTR 665L)</li> <li>5. Shoulder Standardized Patient Encounter (ATTR 355, ATTR 602)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Senior students will achieve an average of 3.5/5.0, Junior students will achieve an average of 3.25/5.0, Sophomore students will achieve an average of 3.0/5.0, and Master's students will achieve an average of 3.25/5.0 on the Preceptor Evaluation of Student related to clinical evaluation and diagnosis. ‡</li> <li>2. 80% of sophomore students will achieve a score of 80% or higher on the Knee Standardized Patient Encounter rubric regarding obtaining a patient history and completing a physical examination</li> <li>3. 80% of students will achieve a score of 80% or higher on the Knee Oral Practical Examination</li> <li>4. 80% of junior students will achieve a score of 80% or</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Seniors students achieved a mean score of 3.78/5.0 and 4.42/5.0, junior students achieved a mean score of 3.77/5.0 and 3.71/5.0, sophomore students achieved a mean score of 3.44/5.0 and 3.57/5.0, and master's students achieved a mean score of 3.19/5.0 and 3.54/5.0 on the preceptor evaluation in the fall and spring semester respectively related to clinical evaluation and diagnosis.</li> <li>2. 10/10 students (100%) achieved a score of 80% or higher on the knee standardized patient rubric.</li> <li>3. 9/11 students (82%) achieved a score of 80% or higher on the knee oral practical examination.</li> <li>4. 8/10 students (80%) and 2/2 students (100%) achieved a score of 80% or higher on the shoulder oral practical</li> </ol>	<p>Course instructors were responsible for collecting data during each respective course. Kirk Armstrong, Professional AT Program Director, organized a meeting of all program faculty to collect relevant assessment data from each course within the program. Kirk Armstrong completed the primary analysis of data. All faculty have reviewed and discussed all aspects course specific assessment data</p> <p>After data were analyzed, all results of the 2016-2017 assessment plan were shared with program faculty. Discussion of assessment results and mechanisms for programmatic change will be items on the first AT faculty meeting in the fall semester.</p>

		<p>higher on the Shoulder Standardized Patient Encounter rubric regarding obtaining a patient history and completing a physical examination</p> <p>5. 80% of students will achieve a score of 80% or higher on the Shoulder Oral Practical Examination</p>	<p>examination.</p> <p>5. 14/14 students (100%) and 2/2 students (100%) achieved a score of 80% or higher in the shoulder standardized patient encounter rubric.</p>	
<p>Demonstrate appropriate immediate and emergency medical care while providing patient-centered care</p> <p>(Alignment to Program Outcome #3; Graduate Outcomes #3, #4, #5)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preceptor Evaluation of Student (ATTR 455/456, ATTR 355/356, ATTR 255/256, ATTR 601/601) related to emergency and immediate care skills</li> <li>2. Protective Equipment Removal Patient Skills Scenario (ATTR 255, ATTR 601)</li> <li>3. Concussion Standardized Patient Encounter (ATTR 355, ATTR 602)</li> <li>4. Spine Boarding Patient Skills Scenario (ATTR 255, ATTR 601)</li> <li>5. Cervical Spine Standardized Patient Encounter (ATTR 255, ATTR 601)</li> <li>6. Cardiac, respiratory, GI practical skills examination (ATTR 355)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Senior students will achieve an average of 3.5/5.0, Junior students will achieve an average of 3.25/5.0, Sophomore students will achieve an average of 3.0/5.0, and Master's students will achieve an average of 3.25/5.0 on the Preceptor Evaluation of Student related to providing appropriate and immediate care. ‡</li> <li>2. 80% of students will achieve a score of 80% or higher on the Protective Equipment Removal Skills Scenario rubric</li> <li>3. 80% of junior students will score 80% or higher on the Concussion Standardized Patient Encounter rubric regarding providing appropriate emergency care</li> <li>4. 80% of students will score 80% or higher on the Spine Boarding Skills Scenario rubric.</li> <li>5. 80% of students will score 80% or higher on the Cervical Spine Standardized Patient Encounter rubric regarding providing</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Seniors students achieved a mean score of 4.04/5.0 and 4.5/5.0, junior students achieved a mean score of 3.83/5.0 and 3.74/5.0, sophomore students achieved a mean score of 3.63/5.0 and 3.53/5.0, and master's students achieved a mean score of 3.36/5.0 and 3.48/5.0 on the preceptor evaluation in the fall and spring semester respectively related to emergency and immediate care skills.</li> <li>2. 12/12 students (100%) and 2/2 students (100%) successfully completed the protective equipment clinical skills check.</li> <li>3. 13/14 students (93%) and 1/2 students (50%) achieved a score of 80% or higher in the concussion standardized patient rubric.</li> <li>4. 12/12 students (100%) and 2/2 students (100%) successfully completed the spine boarding skill check.</li> <li>5. 6/12 students (50%) and 2/2 students (100%) achieved a score of 80% or higher on the cervical spine</li> </ol>	<p>Course instructors were responsible for collecting data during each respective course. Kirk Armstrong, Professional AT Program Director, organized a meeting of all program faculty to collect relevant assessment data from each course within the program. Kirk Armstrong completed the primary analysis of data. All faculty have reviewed and discussed all aspects course specific assessment data</p> <p>After data were analyzed, all results of the 2016-2017 assessment plan were shared with program faculty. Discussion of assessment results and mechanisms for programmatic change will be items on the first AT faculty meeting in the fall semester.</p>

		<p>6. appropriate emergency care 80% of students will achieve a score of 80% or higher on the practical skills examination over the cardiac, respiratory, and GI systems.</p>	<p>6. standardized patient rubric. 14/14 students (100%) achieved a score of 80% or higher on the pathophysiology practical skills examination.</p>	
<p>Interpret relevant data to minimize the risk of injury/illness  (Alignment to Program Outcome #1; Graduate Outcomes #3, #4, #5)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preceptor Evaluation of Student (ATTR 455/456, ATTR 355/356)</li> <li>2. Nutrition Standardized Patient Encounter (ATTR 255, ATTR 601)</li> <li>3. Psychosocial Intervention &amp; Referral Standardized Patient (ATTR 456)</li> <li>4. Environmental Conditions Patient Skills Scenario (ATTR 255, ATTR 601)</li> <li>5. Therapeutic Rehabilitation Patient Skills Practical (ATTR 475, ATTR 575)</li> <li>6. Therapeutic Modalities Patient Skills Practical Exam for (ATTR 472, ATTR 572)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Senior students will achieve an average of 3.5/5.0, Junior students will achieve an average of 3.25/5.0, Sophomore students will achieve an average of 3.0/5.0, and Master's students will achieve an average of 3.25/5.0 on the Preceptor Evaluation of Student related to interpreting patient data to minimize the risk of injury/illness. ‡</li> <li>2. 80% of students will score 80% or higher on the Nutrition Standardized Patient Encounter rubric.</li> <li>3. 80% of students will score 80% or higher on the Psychosocial Intervention &amp; Referral Standardized Patient Encounter rubric</li> <li>4. 80% of students will score 80% or higher on the Environmental Conditions Skills rubric</li> <li>5. 80% of students will score 80% or higher on the Therapeutic Rehabilitation Practical Skills rubric</li> <li>6. 80% of students will score 80% or higher on the Therapeutic Modalities Practical Skills rubric</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Seniors students achieved a mean score of 3.77/5.0 and 4.5/5.0, junior students achieved a mean score of 3.74/5.0 and 3.81/5.0 on the preceptor evaluation in the fall and spring semester respectively related to emergency and immediate care skills. (Sophomore and master's students were not assessed on these skills in the preceptor evaluation)</li> <li>2. 2/12 (17%) and 1/2 (50%) of students achieved a score of 80% or higher in the nutrition standardized patient rubric.</li> <li>3. 17/20 students (85%) achieved a score of 80% or higher on the psychosocial intervention &amp; referral standardized patient rubric.</li> <li>4. 12/12 students (100%) and 2/2 students (100%) successfully completed the environmental conditions skills check.</li> <li>5. 13/15 students (87%) and 2/2 students (100%), along with achieved a score of 80% or higher on the lower and upper extremity rehabilitation projects respectively.</li> <li>6. 9/10 students (90%) achieved a score or 80% or higher on the patient portfolio</li> </ol>	<p>Course instructors were responsible for collecting data during each respective course. Kirk Armstrong, Professional AT Program Director, organized a meeting of all program faculty to collect relevant assessment data from each course within the program. Kirk Armstrong completed the primary analysis of data. All faculty have reviewed and discussed all aspects course specific assessment data.</p> <p>After data were analyzed, all results of the 2016-2017 assessment plan were shared with program faculty. Discussion of assessment results and mechanisms for programmatic change will be items on the first AT faculty meeting in the fall semester.</p>

			rubric, while 2/2 students (100%) achieved a score of 80% or higher on the modalities lab rubric.	
--	--	--	---	--

During the 2016-2017 academic year, the Preceptor Evaluation of Student were revised. The criteria against which students were evaluated did not change, the scoring for how students were scored had changed. Preceptors, healthcare professionals that supervise students during clinical experiences, were made aware of the change in the evaluation during preceptor training, which was held in July, 2016. As a result of the scoring change, the benchmark for desired standard of achievement were revised to match the revising score criteria (3.0/5.0 = Meets Expectations; 4.0/5.0 = Exceeds Expectations, 5.0/5.0 = Fully Competent as Professional).

## 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.**

Based on the results of the 2016-2017 AY, the program has identified additional areas where more emphases are needed (e.g., clinical evaluation and diagnosis, emergency and immediate care, possibly healthcare administration [though it was not reported this year]). It remains that our preceptors (healthcare professionals who supervise students during clinical experiences and patient care) continue to rate the student's knowledge and clinical skills higher than faculty in the classroom and laboratory experiences. Additional time will be spent during preceptor development this summer to ensure that all preceptors are evaluating students in a similar manner. Students overwhelmingly continue to score higher on practical skills examinations than standardized patient evaluations. Practical skills examinations are often isolated bits of knowledge and clinical skill that allow a student to demonstrate their ability to perform essential skills necessary for patient care. Standardized patient evaluations are real-time patient encounters where students have to incorporate several components of knowledge and skill into patient care (similar to what clinical practice is really like). Despite our efforts to provide teaching standardized patients in the classroom, our findings highlight that more time should be spent in the classroom and laboratory settings to allow students to practice skills that mimic patient care (e.g., teaching standardized patients, simulations with task trainers, patient case studies). Additionally, faculty will be reviewing the rubrics used to score students performance during standardized patient encounters, to ensure that the rubric is scoring students appropriately.

Based on the results of previous years national certification examination (2015-2016) the program scored above the national average in one of the five domains of athletic training practice (Organizational & Professional Health and Responsibility). During the current year, results on our national certification exam continue to increase, where we currently boast a 100% first-time pass rate, with 7 of the 20 graduates having completed the exam. We will continue to work with the remaining 13 students, in developing outlines of content to review/study in preparation for the exam. Assessment results from this AY year demonstrate that while we are making improvements in the all practice domains, especially injury/illness prevention and wellness promotion, clinical evaluation and diagnosis, and emergency and immediate care. However, we discussed that need for continued emphases in reviewing clinical skills from semester to semester, not just during class. It should be noted that End of Semester Practical Examinations, a cumulative skills examination relative to the students progression through the program results in 43/48 students (89.6%) in the fall and 37/38 students (97.4%) in the spring achieving a score of 74% or higher on the first attempt.

Communication was a focus of program faculty this year. In addition to our regular monthly meetings, program faculty held dedicated meetings in the fall and spring semesters to collect, review, and analyze assessment data collected from each course. In addition, program faculty developed and outlines specific writing and/or speaking assignments for each class within the program. By identifying these assignments, faculty have developed a scaffolded mechanism for students to not only become good consumers of research, but also improve their skills in being an evidence-based clinician. Faculty also identified common rubric criterion that will be used for each writing and speaking assignment.

For the 2017-2018 AY, the assessment plan will re-examine the practice domains of emergency and immediate care and injury prevention and wellness promotion, while including healthcare administration. The program will keep all benchmarks at an 80% of students achieving a score of 80% or higher, other than the End of Semester Practical Examination, which will remain at a passing score of 74% or higher.

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

Degree Program: B.S./M.S. Athletic Training    Date: December 10, 2017

	<b>Level 0 – Undeveloped</b>	<b>Level 1 – Developing</b>	<b>Level 2 – Mature</b>	<b>Level 3 – Exemplary</b>
<b>1. Student Learning Outcomes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes were identified.  <input type="checkbox"/> No Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes were identified.  <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes.  <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are important, specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that span multiple learning domains.  <input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.
<b>2. Measures &amp; Performance Goals</b>	<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 type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.  <input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.	<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"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.  <input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.  <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were employed, and most are direct.  <input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some <a href="#">high impact practices</a> (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)  <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. <a href="#">No, but it was referenced in Part Two.</a>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.  <input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate that this is appropriate.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.  <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were summarized as well as provided

				<p>to demonstrate that the measure provides specific evidence of what students know/can do.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>
<p><b>3. Results</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><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.</p> <p><input checked="" 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.</p> <p><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. <i>It certainly is improving.</i></p>
<p><b>4. Engagement &amp; Improvement</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No improvements</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance goals and</p>

	<p>(planned or actual) are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.</p>	<p>in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.</p>	<p>implement plans to adjust activities, expectations, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important <a href="#">stakeholders</a> reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.</p>
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 0 – Undeveloped</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 1 - Developing</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 2 – Mature +</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 3 – Exemplary</b>

Excellent work once again. Outcomes are clear and measurable, measures are specific and multiple, and results show that faculty are dedicated to ensuring that students succeed. Additional information (via links or attachments) about your analyses would further strengthen the report, as would answers to two questions: What plans do you have to improve student performance on the Nutrition Standardized Patient Encounter, and why are thirteen of twenty graduates not yet prepared to take the Board of Certification exam?