

## Academic Program Assessment Summary 2019-2020

During the 2019-2020 academic year, academic program outcome assessment began the shift in methodology from course-level to program level through a mission based focus. By using a fundamental framework of program assessment and curriculum mapping, the goal is to employ a process that can actually improve student learning instead of one that only proves student learning has taken place.

At the fall 2019 HLC Assessment Academy Midpoint Conference, the CASC Assessment Academy Team presented a proposal to pilot this new mission-based assessment. After receiving a favorable response, the HPER program implemented the new process while the other academic programs worked on creating mission-based frameworks and revised curriculum maps in preparation to pilot during the 2020-2021 academic year.

Chart I reflects the findings using the current methodology. The aggregated results of all academic programs surpassed the 70% threshold with 86%. As with the past years of assessment results, the assessment process and related data didn't provide a viable means to improve student learning.

Chart II displays the HPER pilot components and results.

### Academic Program Outcome Assessment Results Chart I

Program	Measure	Program Outcomes	SLOs Measured	Students Assessed	Students Meeting Threshold	% Success
Allied Health AS	Course-Embedded	1	9	695	554	83%
		2	6	307	289	94%
		3	2	147	136	93%
		4	2	218	187	86%
		Total	19	1367	1166	85%
Biological and Pre-Professional Sciences AS	Course-Embedded	1	9	71	52	73%
		2	9	350	230	66%
		3	4	34	24	71%
		Total	22	455	306	67%
Business Administration AA	Course-Embedded	1	10	160	143	89%
		2	9	154	131	86%
		3	5	44	40	91%
		4	10	89	73	82%
		Total	34	447	387	87%
Child Development AA/AAS	Course-Embedded	1	22	357	320	90%
		2	14	306	270	88%

		3	6	120	109	91%
		4	7	163	142	87%
		Total	49	946	841	89%
Child Development Directors Certificate	Course-Embedded	1	11	184	167	91%
		2	9	227	198	87%
		3	2	45	40	89%
		4	4	116	100	86%
		Total	26	572	505	88%
Child Development Infant/Tod Certificate	Course-Embedded	1	18	305	280	92%
		2	13	293	260	89%
		3	7	133	122	92%
		4	5	137	119	87%
		Total	43	868	781	90%
Computer Information Systems AA	Course-Embedded	1	3	66	55	83%
		2	6	69	65	94%
		3	3	47	43	92%
		Total	12	182	163	90%
Computer Technology AAS	Course-Embedded	1				%
		2	5	61	57	93%
		3				%
		4				%
		Total	5	61	57	93%
Health, Physical Ed. & Recreation AA	Course-Embedded	1	2	68	61	90%
		2	5	120	113	94%
		3	4	105	98	93%
		4	5	99	95	96%
		Total	16	392	367	94%
Math, Physical Science, & Pre-Engineering AS	Course-Embedded	1	13	95	70	74%
		2	8	59	42	71%
		3	7	52	37	71%
		Total	28	206	149	72%
Occupational Health & Safety AAS	Course-Embedded	1	4	50	50	100%
		2	4	50	44	88%
		3	3	36	30	83%
		4	6	72	56	78%
		Total	17	208	180	87%
Nursing AAS	Course-Embedded	1	2	99	86	87%
		2	2	99	90	91%
		3	2	91	91	100%

		4	2	91	91	100%
		5	2	91	90	99%
		Total	10	471	448	95%
Pre-Law/Criminal Justice AA	Course-Embedded	1	12	297	257	87%
		2	4	129	110	85%
		3	6	187	166	89%
		4	10	253	216	85%
		Total	32	866	749	86%
History/Political Science AA	Course-Embedded	1	4	334	299	90%
		2	8	1121	988	88%
		3	5	220	188	85%
		4	10	935	817	87%
		Total	27	2610	2292	88%
Sociology/Psychology AA	Course-Embedded	1	2	341	278	82%
		2				%
		3	2	309	241	78%
		Total	4	650	519	80%

### HPER Program Pilot of Mission-Based Program Assessment Results Chart II

HPER Program Pilot	Measure	Program Outcomes	Curriculum Map Level of Instruction	Students Assessed	Met Rubric Threshold
Course	Course-Embedded				
HPER 1103 Intro to HPER	Demonstration	1	Introduced	4 out of 12	Yes
HPER 2103 Care & Prevention of Athletic Injuries	Report	3	Reinforced	5 out of 12	No

### Pilot Findings & Analysis

#### **Program Outcome 1**

*PO #1A:*

*The sample of students evaluated exceeded the rubric (see attached) threshold score of “3” on a scale of 1-4 (1 denotes “Beginning,” 4 denotes “Advanced”) with a mean score of **3.5/3.0***

*PO #1C:*

*The sample of students evaluated did not reach the rubric threshold score of 3 on a scale of 1-4 (1 denotes “Beginning,” 4 denotes “Advanced”) with a mean score of **2.8/3.0***

*Mean Score (A & C) = **3.15 (Above set threshold)***

**Discussion:** *The evaluators felt the students performed well with the signature assignment for the measure used for PO #1A “Physical Education Assignment and Demonstration.” The assignment asks the student to develop and conduct a 30-minute activity to their peers. Faculty members felt the motivation of the students is high for this assignment since the majority of HPER majors’ career choice is to be a coach and/or physical education instructor at some level. The instructors feel this is an enjoyable section of the course to teach because the motivation level of the students is so high. The faculty is satisfied that this key indicator is being instructed and received well by the students. Judging by the consistent quality of the demonstrations produced and the enthusiasm of the students, the faculty feel quality learning is taking place, especially given the introductory nature of this course.*

**Conclusion:** *The evaluators recommend keeping this signature assignment and continuing to instruct it at the same level. It is also recommended that the instructors place more emphasis on the importance of the assignment to possibly motivate the lower achieving students.*

*The evaluators were not satisfied with the level of learning for the signature assignment for the measure PO #1C “Presentation of HPER Career Fields & Salaries.” This signature assignment requires students to give a presentation over 12 general career fields presented in the textbook, such as physical education, exercise science, sports medicine, etc. The presentation is to include defining the career field and the education level required for each and giving an approximate salary for each discipline. The faculty feel that students are having a difficult time grasping and/or assigning importance to the more advanced disciplines, especially given the generalized nature of the fields outlined in the textbook. Also at this stage of education, most of the students have “tunnel vision” to want to be coaches only. Since this is a relatively new course for the instructor to teach, she feels she is “teaching too much from the text book” without adding much of her own expertise to the course and is only recently beginning to personalize the course to make it more meaningful to the audience.*

### **Program Outcome 3**

PO #3A:

*The sample of students evaluated did not reach the rubric threshold score of 3 on a scale of 1-4 (1 denotes “Beginning,” 4 denotes “Advanced”) with a mean score of 2.3/3.0*

**Discussion:** *The evaluators did not feel the students and instructor performed well on the measures of signature assignment “Ankle Injury Verbal Demonstration,” which asks the student to provide a verbal report to the instructor of the different types of ankle injury and the mechanisms of injury that cause different ankle problems. Because of the interrelatedness of PO #3A and PO #3B, the evaluators feel that the PO #3B “Discussion” applies to both.*

PO #3B:

*The sample of students evaluated did not reach the rubric threshold score of 3 on a scale of 1-4 (1 denotes “Beginning,” 4 denotes “Advanced”) with a mean score of 2.5/3.0*

**Discussion:** The evaluators did not feel the students and instructor performed well on the measures of signature assignment “Ankle Injury Verbal Demonstration,” which asks the student to provide a verbal report to the instructor of the different types of ankle injury and the mechanisms of injury that cause different ankle problems. Because of the interrelatedness of PO #3A and PO #3B, the evaluators feel that the PO #3B “Discussion” applies to both.

PO #3B:

The sample of students evaluated did not reach the rubric threshold score of 3 on a scale of 1-4 (1 denotes “Beginning,” 4 denotes “Advanced”) with a mean score of **2.5/3.0**

**Discussion:** The measure used for the signature assignment for PO #3B is “Ankle Evaluation Verbal Demonstration” where each student is required to give a verbal report to the instructor over the steps of evaluating a lateral ankle sprain. The evaluators did not feel the students or the instructor performed well on the measure’s signature assignment. Both signature assignments ask the student to demonstrate an understanding of ankle anatomy (bones, tendons, and ligaments) and medical terminology related to the ankle. The evaluators feel that since most students enter the course without human anatomy and medical terminology (neither are part of the HPER degree plan). This is a weakness in the educational process. The evaluators feel that most students had a good grasp of the mechanism of injury for a lateral ankle sprain; it was their unfamiliarity with ankle anatomy and medical terminology that was lacking. It was also reported by the faculty that approximately 1/3 of the students lacked the necessary motivation to seriously complete the assignment with one student even remarking “This isn’t the coach’s job; it is the trainer’s job.” These students are not perceiving the importance of the assignment. It is also noted by the evaluators that some students do not perform well giving a verbal report in a one-on-one setting with the instructor.

**Conclusion:** The evaluators recommend that since there is an identified weakness with anatomy and medical terminology and even though the instructor allocates time in the teaching process for these subjects, the instructor needs to spend additional time and possibly make assignments over the related anatomy and medical terminology of the ankle. Also, the instructor needs to emphasize the importance of these assignments to the students more and possibly find new ways to get the importance across to the students.

PO #3C:

The sample of students evaluated did not reach the rubric threshold score of 3 on a scale of 1-4 (1 denotes “Beginning,” 4 denotes “Advanced”) with a mean score of **2.5/3.0**  
Mean Score (A, B, &C) = **2.43 (below set threshold)**

**Discussion:** The evaluators did not feel the students and instructor performed well on the measures of signature assignment “Ankle Taping Demonstration.” The assignment requires the students to use athletic tape to tape the ankle with prescribed steps. It is the opinion of the instructor that the skills to tape an ankle to a “competent” standard are lacking in the students. Because this is the first time students are introduced to athletic taping and since taping an ankle is a psychomotor skill that requires a lot of practice and repetition, the instructor feels that if it is possible, more practice time is needed prior to completion of the assignment. Because of the

*abbreviated amount of time allocated during the semester to cover ankle mechanism of injury, ankle evaluation, and perform an ankle taping demonstration, additional time to complete the signature assignments for PO #3 may not be available.*

**Conclusion:** *The evaluators recommend that the instructor look at other aspects of the course that students grasp readily, ascertain if instructional time could be shortened for these readily grasped aspects, and devote the extra time to the signature assignment. Additionally, since ankle injury, evaluation, and ankle taping are the first injury introduced to in the semester and taping an ankle is one of the more difficult psychomotor skills introduced in the course, the evaluators recommend sequencing the taping skills in a different order to allow for practice with easier psychomotor skills first.*

*In addition, the evaluators recommend that the HPER assessment committee reevaluate the thresholds set for PO #3, as they may have been set too high for an introductory course in sports medicine that is mostly taken by students desiring to be coaches.*

### **Overall HPER Program Analysis – Big Takeaways about Student Learning**

- *While student learning is taking place, it is not at the level of satisfaction for the evaluators or faculty members.*
- *Learning is not a student or faculty problem, but there are multifactorial reasons for the lower satisfaction level of student learning.*
- *Student learning is not bad, but the process identified areas of weakness.*
- *Two of the main themes noticed are students not assigning importance to assignments and faculty management of class time during the semester.*
- *Students are not learning PO#3 at the level of satisfaction to the HPER faculty. This came somewhat as a surprise for the faculty members concerning the signature assignments that were developed.*
- *Since the data centered on one section of the course with a relatively small sample size, one data point does not make a trend.*

### **Pilot Plans of Action**

The HPER program's response to program outcomes assessment included instructional changes along with process improvements:

#### **PO #1A: HPER 1103 Introduction to HPER**

*Keep the signature assignment and continue to instruct it at the same level. Instructors place more emphasis on the importance of the assignment.*

#### **PO #1C: HPER 1103 Introduction to HPER** Keep signature assignment

*Faculty members continue to personalize the course.*

*Instructors make the signature assignment more meaningful to the students.*

#### **PO #3A & PO #3B: HPER 2103 Care & Prevention of Athletic Injuries**

*Keep signature assignment.*

*Instructors need to spend additional time instructing anatomy and medical terminology related to the ankle.*

*Make assignments over the related anatomy and medical terminology of the ankle.*

*Emphasize the importance of these assignments*  
PO #3C: HPER 2103 Care & Prevention of Athletic Injuries

*Keep signature assignment*

*Look at other aspects of the course that students grasp readily Ascertain if instructional time could be shortened for these readily grasped aspects*

*Devote the extra time to the signature assignments*

*Sequencing the taping skills in a different order to allow for practice with easier psychomotor skills first*

*HPER assessment committee reevaluates the thresholds set for PO #3*

Additional conclusions

*In addition, it is noted that the student sample size evaluated per course may be too low.*

*With such a small sample size, a single outlier could easily skew the outcomes.*

*Re-evaluate the “threshold” to possibly match the Level of Instruction Criteria.*

*Additional data points need to be gathered in the future to establish a data trend.*

*The faculty may need to consider some instructional changes.*

Concerning program improvements and action plans, those initiatives are detailed below:

- *Develop more “signature assignments” that cover multiple performance indicators per program outcomes.*
- *Instruct all HPER faculty in the use of the “Program Scoring Rubric”*
- *Educate all HPER faculty in the interpretation of the data gathered by the rubric*
- *Advise all HPER faculty to not use only “course embedded assignments”*
- *Change the mentality of HPER faculty that test scores are not necessarily good indicators of knowledge acquisition*
- *Inform HPER faculty that qualitative findings are as important as quantitative findings*
- *Develop ways to teach adjunct faculty all of the above*
- *Remember to consult the Curriculum Map and Level of Instruction Criteria for each course to be sure the program is being assessed at the proper level*
- *Begin to use more sections of courses for the assessment process*
  - Multiple sections taught by an individual instructor*
  - Multiple sections of same course taught by different instructors*
- *Consider changing the sample size of students evaluated*
- *Use the previous semester’s data instead of the current semester’s data*
  - Some “signature assignments” may have not been completed prior to assessment deadline if using the current semester.*
- *Try not to “do too much” therefore making the assessment process not meaningful*
- *Break up the assessment process into more stages for ease of planning, gathering and interpretation of the process*
- *Consider assessing each Level of Instruction (I, R, A) at different times*
- *Develop a more efficient Assessment Reporting Form with “guiding questions”*
- *Develop a definitive threshold score represented on the rubric for each Performance Indicator*

**Plans of Action for Academic Program Assessment**

- All academic programs began implementing their plans of action based upon 2018-2019 assessment analyses after the HPER pilot plan received constructive criticism and favorable reviews at the HLC Academy Midpoint Event in November 2019.
- All academic programs were provided step-by-step instructions and deadlines for framework and map completion during the spring 2020 semester as preparation to implement the new process during the 2020-2021 academic year.
- The last major project task planned for spring 2020 was creation of program assessment plans detailing where and how student achievement would be measured in the upcoming year. Safety guidelines for the COVID-19 virus had required all courses to be moved online and all faculty and staff to work from home. Although project work was temporarily interrupted, programs are on a clear path to implement their pilots during the 2020-2021 academic year.