

EWU Programmatic SLO Assessment

AY 2015-16 and “Closing the Loop” for AY 2014-15

Introduction:

Assessment of student learning is an important and integrated part of faculty and programs. As part of ongoing program assessment at Eastern Washington University, each department is asked to report on assessment results for *each* program and *each* certificate for *at least one* Student Learning Outcome (SLO) this year. To comply with accreditation standards, the programs must also demonstrate efforts to “close the loop” in improving student learning and/or the learning environment. Thus, this template has been revised into two parts.

Resources:

Check this site for sample reports (created with the previous year’s template) by EWU programs and other assessment resources: <http://access.ewu.edu/graduate-education/academic-planning/faculty-support/student-learning-assessment/sample-program-slo-assessment-reports>

Additional resources and support are available to:

- 1) Determine whether students can do, know or value program goals upon graduation and to what extent;
- 2) Determine students’ progress through the program, while locating potential bottlenecks, curricular redundancies, and more; and
- 3) Embed assessments in sequenced and meaningful ways that save time.

Contact Dr. Helen Bergland for assistance with assessment in support of student learning and pedagogical approaches: hberglan@ewu.edu or 509.359.4305.

Use this template to report on your program assessment. **Reports are due to your Dean and to Dr. Helen Bergland (hberglan@ewu.edu), Interim Director for the Faculty Commons, by September __, 2016.**

Degree/Certificate: Bachelor of Science Degree

Major/Option: Athletic Training Major

Submitted by: Garth Babcock

Date: February 9, 2017

Part I – Program SLO Assessment Report for 2015-16

Part I – for the 2015-16 academic year: Because Deans have been asked to create College-Level Synthesis Reports annually, the template has been slightly modified for a) clarity for Chairs and Directors, and b) a closer fit with what the Deans and Associate Deans are being asked to report.

1. **Student Learning Outcome:** The student performance or learning outcome as published either in the catalog or elsewhere in your department literature.

SLO selected: *Students will demonstrate professional behaviors of entry level Athletic Trainers.*

2. **Overall evaluation of progress on outcome:** Indicate whether or not the SLO has been met, and if met, to what level.

_____ SLO is met after changes resulting from ongoing assessments, referencing assessment results from the previous year to highlight revisions;
_____ SLO is met, but with changes forthcoming;
_____ SLO is met without change required

SLO was partially met. Two of the three Strategies used to measure the SLO were met, the third was not met at the programs desired level.

3. **Strategies and methods:** Description of assessment method and choices, why they were used and how they were implemented.

Three strategies were used to measure this SLO:

1. Students will obtain a 4/5 on a 5 point scale on their evaluations by their preceptors for all 3 quarters of their senior year.

2. Senior students will develop and complete a research project that will be submitted for and accepted to be presented orally at either the District Convention Student Forum or at the University's Graduate and Undergraduate Student Research Symposium

3. Students will successfully complete the Programs CEU requirements (65 CEU's each year for 3 years covering all 5 CEU categories)

4. **Observations gathered from data:** Include findings and analyses based on the strategies and methods identified in item #3.

a. Findings:

1. Not all students were able to obtain a 4/5 or better grade on their quarterly evaluations by preceptors.
2. 100% of students were able to present an oral presentation (one of 3 groups at the District convention and the other 2 groups at the symposium).
3. 100% of students completed the CEU program

b. Analysis of findings:

We sought student and preceptor feedback as to possible reasons why the scores were low and determined that there may be inconsistency between what the preceptor and the student understood related to the grading criteria.

5. **What program changes will be made based on the assessment results?**

- a) Describe plans to improve student learning based on assessment findings (e.g., course content, course sequencing, curriculum revision, learning environment or student advising).

For the 2016-2017 academic year:

1. We have implemented a student "self" evaluation process that we hope will cause the students to reflect on what is being measured as well as their own personal level of achievement of each point in the Preceptor evaluation. The student will have access to this evaluation throughout each quarter as a reference and then at the end of the quarter to self-evaluate before meeting with the Preceptor.
2. We sought student and preceptor feedback on the scoring used in the preceptor evaluation and adjusted the Likert scale to better reflect the preceptor and student understanding and expectations related to each possible score (what does a 3/5 or 4/5 or 5/5 actually look like).

- b) Provide a broad timeline of how and when identified changes will be addressed in the upcoming year.

The changes were implemented in Fall 2016 so students could complete the "Self Evaluation" at the end of each quarter in an effort to compare their perception to that of their clinical preceptor at the end of each Quarter 2016-2017 academic year.

6. Description of revisions to the assessment process the results suggest are needed and an evaluation of the assessment plan/process itself.

We felt that our assessment plan (assessing student clinical performance and student CEUs quarterly as requiring 3rd year students to apply to and present at the District or EWU Student Research Symposium was a good plan. However, we felt that we could enhance the plan through clarifying the expectations on the grading scale and by having students self-reflect before meeting with the preceptor for evaluation.

NEW: PART II – CLOSING THE LOOP
FOLLOW-UP FROM THE 2014-15 PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT

In response to the university's accrediting body, the [Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities](#), this section has been added. This should be viewed as a follow up to the previous year's findings. In other words, begin with findings from 2014-15, and then describe actions taken during 2015-16 to improve student learning along, provide a brief summary of findings, and describe possible next steps.

PLEASE NOTE: The university also requests that Deans complete a College-Level Synthesis report, which synthesizes which programs/certificates have demonstrated "closing-the-loop" assessments and findings based on the previous year's assessment report.

Working definition for closing the loop: *Using assessment results to improve student learning as well as pedagogical practices. This is an essential step in the continuous cycle of assessing student learning. It is the collaborative process through which programs use evidence of student learning to gauge the efficacy of collective educational practices, and to identify and implement strategies for improving student learning.* Adapted 8.21.13 from <http://www.hamline.edu/learning-outcomes/closing-loop.html>.

1. Student Learning Outcome(s) assessed for 2014-15

SLO selected - Gain clinical experiences in a variety of service learning settings that will allow them to be prepared to work in the diverse opportunities found within the field of Athletic Training.

2. Strategies implemented during 2015-16 to improve student learning, based on findings of the 2014-15 assessment activities.

The SLO was met during the 2014-2015 academic year. However we sought to implement the following:

1. Increase number of students – to allow us to make better use of all of the clinical placements and preceptor that we currently have.

2. Increase marketing and seek to recruit more students to be able to fill more clinical sites.

3. Summary of results (may include comparative data or narrative; description of changes made to curriculum, pedagogy, mode of delivery, etc.): Describe the effect of the changes towards improving student learning and/or the learning environment.

All 1st Year students made it through a general university rotation, 3 weeks with 3 different sports during Fall quarter. They all made it through a 10 week rotation with a single university team either winter or spring quarter with the opposite (winter or spring) containing a rotation for 2 days a week at a high school and 1 day a week at a PT/Chiropractic/Hospital clinic for a 10 week rotation.

We had 7 of 10 of the 2nd Year students placed with an EWU sports team for pre, in and post seasons over the three quarters. We had 3 of the 2nd Year students at HS setting for Fall, Winter and Spring quarters.

We had 3 of the 3rd year students at high school settings for all 3 quarters and 7 with sports that are on campus (EWU) for pre, in and post season experiences.

We also had two first year students that were placed with a professional arena football team during Spring quarter. Usually this is reserved for 2nd year students, but because we are lower in student numbers we did not have 2nd Year students to send.

We did not have students at all settings this year because of lower numbers

4. What **further changes to curriculum, pedagogy, mode of delivery**, etc. are projected based on closing-the-loop data, findings and analysis?

5.

We desired to increase the number of students in the program to better fill all of our clinical sight opportunities. Thought we selected 17 students to enter the program in 2014-2015 (our typical number is 10 to 15, the overall number of students remaining in the program after attrition during 2015-2016 has only increased by one (N = 33 vs N = 32).

We sought to increase our marketing to help increase our student numbers (we can accommodate up to 40 students and were at 32 students in 2014-2015). In 2015-2016 we attended the High School Sports Medicine Conference and competition and talked about our program and what we had to offer. We are not sure of the overall outcome, but have had an increased number of students (31 vs 25) in the Introduction to Athletic Training course. We have also had an increase in the number of advising appointments seeking to know how to apply to the program in 2016-2017.

Definitions:

1. **Student Learning Outcome:** The student performance or learning objective as published either in the catalog or elsewhere in your department literature.
2. **Overall evaluation of progress on outcome:** This checklist informs the reader whether or not the SLO has been met, and if met, to what level.
3. **Strategies and methods used to gather student performance data,** including assessment instruments used, and a description of how and when the assessments were conducted. Examples of strategies/methods: embedded test questions in a course or courses, portfolios, in-class activities, standardized test scores, case studies, analysis of written projects, etc. Additional information could describe the use of rubrics, etc. as part of the assessment process.
4. **Observations gathered from data:** This section includes findings and analyses based on the above strategies and methods, and provides data to substantiate the distinction made in #2. For that reason this section has been divided into parts (a) and (b) to provide space for both the findings and the analysis of findings.
5. **Program changes based on the assessment results:** This section is where the program lists plans to improve student learning, based on assessment findings, and provides a broad timeline of how and when identified changes will be addressed in the upcoming year. Programs often find assessment is part of an ongoing process of continual improvement.
6. **Description of revisions to the assessment process the results suggest are needed.** Evaluation of the assessment plan and process itself: what worked in the assessment planning and process, what did not, and why.

Some elements of this document have been drawn or adapted from the University of Massachusetts' assessment handbook, "Program-Based Review and Assessment: Tools and Techniques for Program Improvement" (2001). Retrieved from http://www.umass.edu/oapa/oapa/publications/online_handbooks/program_based.pdf