

2021-2022 Assessment Cycle

Assessment Findings

Program Assessment Accomplishments

The program, which consists of 1 full-time faculty and 2 adjuncts who teach 1 course per semester or less, revised the assessment plan and gained approval through the School of Applied Studies. The plan just went into effect in Fall 2021. So far the new plan, inclusive of new PLSOs and assessment measures, has proven to offer a strong foundation for assessing student achievement. However, as a new plan, adjustments may be needed. It is too early to make changes at this time as the small n-value from the data is not sufficient yet.

For the first time, an Assessment Group has been formed to review and respond to assessment data annually. As a program that does not have programmatic accreditation, prepare graduates for a professional license, nor receive Perkins funding, the decision was made to establish a more intimate Assessment Group as opposed to broader advisory board. This decision may shift, but for the next two years the plan is to utilize a 5-member Assessment Group.

Note that I (current program coordinator) was not part of the development of the prior assessment plan. It was established before my July 2019 start in the MHS program. The new plan moves the program away from using non-specific measures such as time-to-graduation, student GPA, and end-of-course grades as measures. These non-specific measures did not allow for granular information about student PLSO achievement, making data-driven improvements difficult. The new plan reflects current recommendations for assessment plans and measures in that there is a mix of direct and indirect measures and course-specific and program-wide measures. Also, it was intentional to have measures span the continuum of the program as that provides insight into how students progress across time.

Finding per Measure

MHS PSLOs - Effective Fall 2021

PSLO #1

Outcome: Apply sound strategies and methods in the development of learning experiences that meet the needs of learners.

- ▼ **Measure:** Objective 1.1 - Apply theoretical frameworks of learning and instructional technology integration.
Course level Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: AL626 - Week 5 Assignment
Collected at the conclusion of the course offering (Spring) by the course instructor or in May/June by the program coordinator.

Acceptable Target: 85% of students will score 85% or higher on the scoring guide.

Findings for Objective 1.1 - Apply theoretical frameworks of learning and instructional technology integration.


Summary of Findings: Met benchmark, 7/7 (100%) earned scoring guide grade of 85% or higher.

Results : Acceptable Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: This is a new plan and the n-value for the measure is small (n=7). With a small data set, it will take some time before patterns will be noticeable. Will monitor across additional assessment cycles. Recommendation is to continue the current trajectory.

Reflections/Notes: The use of D2L embedded scoring guide made it very easy to collect and report the data.

Substantiating Evidence:

 PSLO1_Ojb1_Evidence (Adobe Acrobat Document)

▼ **Measure:** Objective 1.2 - Apply sound design principles to the development of instructional experiences
Course level Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: AL720 Week7/8 Assignment
Collected at the conclusion of the course offering (Spring) by the course instructor or in May/June by

the program coordinator.

Acceptable Target:

85% of students will score 85% or higher on the scoring guide.

Findings for Objective 1.2 - Apply sound design principles to the development of instructional experiences

Summary of Findings:

Did not meet the benchmark, 7 students were enrolled in the course, but one did not complete the assignment. A total of 6 submissions were evaluated (n=6). Results showed that 4/6 (66.7%) earned a scoring guide grade of 85% or higher and 2/6 (33.3%) earned scoring guide grades of less than 85%

Results :

Acceptable Target Achievement: Not Met

Recommendations:


After reviewing the specific assignment submission, it was noted that 2 students failed to address one or more of the rubric criteria.

The instructor reviewed the directions, template, and scoring guide and found opportunities to better communicate the expectations of the assignment to students. One major change was to the scoring guide. The updated guide (ready for use in spring 2023) provides more description, especially for criteria that 2 student submissions missed altogether.

Reflections/Notes:

This measure helped the program improve its communication of expectations to students. Finding opportunities for improvement is the point of developing assessment practices.

Substantiating Evidence:

 PSLO1_Obj2_Evidence (Adobe Acrobat Document)

- ▼ **Measure:** Objective 1.3 - Apply sound strategies and methods in the development of learning experiences that meet the needs of learners.
Program level Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:	Graduate Survey, Question 5A. Collected after each spring semester by program coordinator.
Acceptable Target:	No less than a mean score of 3.25 on a 5-point agreement scale.

Findings for Objective 1.3 - Apply sound strategies and methods in the development of learning experiences that meet the needs of learners.

Summary of Findings:	Met benchmark, 4.75 score on 5.0 scale.
Results :	Acceptable Target Achievement: Met
Recommendations:	This is a new plan and the n-value for the measure is small (n=4). With a small data set, it will take some time before patterns will be noticeable. Will monitor across additional assessment cycles. The recommendation is to continue the current trajectory.
Reflections/Notes:	So far it is encouraging that program graduates recognize their achievement of the specific PSLO as a result of completing the program.

Substantiating Evidence:

[PSLO1_Obj3_Evidence_June2022.pdf \(Adobe Acrobat Document\)](#)

PSLO #2

Outcome: Develop assessments intended to guide instruction or evaluate effectiveness.

▼ **Measure:** Objective 2.1 - Plan and design various types of assessments that align with learning targets and serve their intended purposes.

Course level Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:	AL624 – Week 4 Assignment Collected at the conclusion of the course offering (Fall) by the course instructor or in May/June by the program coordinator.
Acceptable Target:	85% of students will score 85% or higher on the scoring guide.

Findings for Objective 2.1 - Plan and design various types of assessments that align with learning targets and serve their intended purposes.

Summary of Findings:	Met benchmark, 9/10 (100%) earned scoring guide grade of 85% or higher.
Results :	Acceptable Target Achievement: Met
Recommendations:	This is a new plan and the n-value for the measure is small (n=10). With a small data set, it will take some time before patterns will be noticeable. Will monitor across additional assessment cycles. The recommendation is to continue the current trajectory.

Reflections/Notes:

Substantiating Evidence:

[PSLO2_Obj1_Evidence_June2022.pdf \(Adobe Acrobat Document\)](#)

- ▼ **Measure:** Objective 2.2 - Compare strategies for evaluating the effectiveness of health professions programs.


Course level Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:	AL720 Week 1 Discussion Collected at conclusion of course (Spring) by the course instructor or in May/June by the program coordinator.
Acceptable Target:	85% of students will score at a level of "meets expectations" (B) or higher on the Prompt 1 criterion.

Findings for Objective 2.2 - Compare strategies for evaluating the effectiveness of health professions programs.

Summary of Findings:	Met benchmark, 7/7 (100%) earned a rubric criterion score of 85% or higher.
Results :	Acceptable Target Achievement: Met
Recommendations:	This is a new plan and the n-value for the measure is small (n=7). With a small data set, it will take some time before patterns will be noticeable. Will monitor across additional assessment cycles. The recommendation is to continue the current trajectory.
Reflections/Notes:	Because the specific rubric criterion measure was noted in D2L, it made students aware that their level of achievement was part of the program's assessment practice. Additional, because it was embedded in D2L it was easy to report the findings.

Substantiating Evidence:

 PSLO2_Obj2_Evidence_June2022.pdf (Adobe Acrobat Document)

- ▼ **Measure:** Objective 2.3 - Develop assessments intended to guide instruction or evaluate effectiveness.

Details/Description: Graduate Survey, Question 5B
Collected at the conclusion of the spring semester by program coordinator.

Acceptable Target: No less than a mean score of 3.25 on a 5-point agreement scale.

Findings for Objective 2.3 - Develop assessments intended to guide instruction or evaluate effectiveness.

Summary of Findings: Met benchmark, 4.75 score on 5.0 scale.

Results : Acceptable Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: This is a new plan. With a small data set (n=4), it will take some time before patterns will be noticeable. Will monitor across additional years, but so far the results are encouraging.

Reflections/Notes: So far it is encouraging that program graduates recognize their achievement of the specific PSLO as a result of completing the program.

Substantiating Evidence:

[PSLO2_Obj3_Evidence_June2022.pdf \(Adobe Acrobat Document\)](#)

Outcome: Recognize ethical responsibilities of health care and education professionals.

- ▼ **Measure:** Objective 3.1 - Examine dilemmas in health care ethics.
Course level Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: AL601 Final Assignment
Collected at conclusion of course (Spring) by the course instructor or in May/June by the program coordinator.

Acceptable Target: 85% of students will score 85 or higher on rubric

Findings for Objective 3.1 - Examine dilemmas in health care ethics.

Summary of Findings: Met benchmark, 7/7 (100%) earned "Meets Expectations" or higher.

Results : Acceptable Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: This is a new plan and the n-value for the measure is small (n=7). With a small data set, it will take some time before patterns will be noticeable. Will monitor across additional assessment cycles. The recommendation is to continue the current trajectory.

Reflections/Notes:

- ▼ **Measure:** Objective 3.2 - Examine ethical responsibilities of educational researchers
Course level Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: AL620 Case Study Analysis
Collected at conclusion of course (Fall) by the

course instructor or in May/June by the program coordinator.

Acceptable Target:

85% of students will score at a level of “meets expectations” (B) or higher on the rubric.

Findings for Objective 3.2 - Examine ethical responsibilities of educational researchers

Summary of Findings:

Met benchmark, 8/8 (100%) submissions earned “meets expectations” or higher on rubric.

Results :

Acceptable Target Achievement: Met


Recommendations:

This is a new plan and the n-value for the measure is small (n=8). With a small data set, it will take some time before patterns will be noticeable. Will monitor across additional assessment cycles. The recommendation is to continue the current trajectory.

Reflections/Notes:

Like most of the course-level assessment measures in this plan, this was a new course assessment. Students seemed to understand the expectations and met or exceeded them.

Substantiating Evidence:

 PSLO3_Obj2_Evidence_June2022.pdf (Adobe Acrobat Document)

▼ **Measure:** Objective 3.3 - Recognize ethical responsibilities of health care and educational professionals.

Program level Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Graduate Survey, Question 5C
Collected at the conclusion of the spring semester by program coordinator.

Acceptable Target: No less than a mean score of 3.25 on a 5-point agreement scale.

Findings for Objective 3.3 - Recognize ethical responsibilities of health care and educational professionals.


Summary of Findings: Met benchmark, 4.75 score on 5.0 scale.

Results : Acceptable Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: This is a new plan. With a small data set (n=4), it will take some time before patterns will be noticeable. Will monitor across additional years, but so far the results are encouraging.

Reflections/Notes: So far it is encouraging that program graduates recognize their achievement of the specific PSLO as a result of completing the program.

Substantiating Evidence:

 PSLO3_Obj3_Evidence_June2022.pdf (Adobe Acrobat Document)

PSLO #4

Outcome: Analyze issues or trends relevant to health care and education practice.

- ▼ **Measure:** Objective 4.1 - Identify recent trends in the nature of board responsibilities and their implications for the governance of health care orga
Course level Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: AL603 Week 7 Discussion
Collected at conclusion of course (Spring) by the course instructor or in May/June by the program coordinator.

Acceptable Target: 85% of students will score at a level of “meets expectations” (B) on the rubric.

Findings for Objective 4.1 - Identify recent trends in the nature of board responsibilities and their implications for the governance of health care orga

Summary of Findings: Met benchmark, 6/6 (100%) earned an overall rubric level of “Meets Expectations” or higher.

Results : Acceptable Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: This is a new plan and the n-value for the measure is small (n=6). With a small data set, it will take some time before patterns will be noticeable. Will monitor across additional assessment cycles. The recommendation is to continue the current trajectory.

Reflections/Notes: This assessment is an example of collaboration with an adjunct to solidify a course-based assessment measure.

Substantiating Evidence:

[PSLO4_Obj1_Evidence_June2022.pdf \(Adobe Acrobat Document\)](#)

▼ **Measure:** Objective 4.2 - Analyze an instructional technology issue or trend.
Course level Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: AL626 Technology Trend/Issue Article Analysis
Collected at conclusion of course (Spring) by the course instructor or in May/June by the program

coordinator.

Acceptable Target:

85% of students will score at a level of “meets expectations” (B) or higher on the rubric.

Findings for Objective 4.2 - Analyze an instructional technology issue or trend.

Summary of Findings:

Met benchmark, 7/7 had an overall rubric score at the level of “meets expectations” (B) or higher.

Results :


Acceptable Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations:

This is a new plan and the n-value for the measure is small (n=7). With a small data set, it will take some time before patterns will be noticeable. Will monitor across additional assessment cycles. The recommendation is to continue the current trajectory.

Reflections/Notes:

Substantiating Evidence:

 PSLO4_Obj2_Evidence_June2022.pdf (Adobe Acrobat Document)

▼ **Measure:** Objective 4.3 - Analyze issues or trends relevant to health care and education practice.

Details/Description:

Graduate Survey, Question 5D
Collected at the conclusion of the spring semester by program coordinator.

Acceptable Target:

No less than a mean score of 3.25 on a 5-point agreement scale.

Findings for Objective 4.3 - Analyze issues or trends relevant to

health care and education practice.

Summary of Findings:	Met benchmark, 4.75 score on 5.0 scale.
Results :	Acceptable Target Achievement: Met
Recommendations:	This is a new plan. With a small data set (n=4), it will take some time before patterns will be noticeable. Will monitor across additional years, but so far the results are encouraging.
Reflections/Notes:	So far it is encouraging that program graduates recognize their achievement of the specific PSLO as a result of completing the program.

Substantiating Evidence:

[PSLO4_Obj3_Evidence_June2022.pdf \(Adobe Acrobat Document\)](#)

PSLO #5

Outcome: Synthesize information from credible and relevant sources for an applied purpose.

▼ **Measure:** Objective 5.1 - Evaluate and synthesize credible and relevant information sources

Course level Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:	AL724 Capstone I Annotated Bibliography Collected at conclusion of course (Fall) by the course instructor or in May/June by the program coordinator.
----------------------	---

Acceptable Target: 85% of students will score 85 or higher on rubric

Findings for Objective 5.1 - Evaluate and synthesize credible and relevant information sources

Summary of Findings: Met benchmark, 5/5 (100%) earned 85% or higher on rubric.

Results : Acceptable Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: This is a new plan and the n-value for the measure is small (n=5). With a small data set, it will take some time before patterns will be noticeable. Will monitor across additional assessment cycles. The recommendation is to continue the current trajectory.

Reflections/Notes:

▼ **Measure:** Objective 5.2a - Synthesize information from credible and relevant sources for an applied purpose.

Course level Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: AL726 Capstone II Project 3rd Draft of Report Collected at conclusion of course (Spring) by the course instructor or in May/June by the program coordinator.

Acceptable Target: 80% of students will score 85% or higher on the common elements of 3rd draft report rubric.

Findings for Objective 5.2a - Synthesize information from credible and relevant sources for an applied purpose.

Summary of Findings: Met benchmark, 4/4 (100%) earned 85% or higher on all common rubric criteria.

Results : Acceptable Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: This is a new plan and the n-value for the

measure is small (n=4). With a small data set, it will take some time before patterns will be noticeable. Will monitor across additional assessment cycles. The recommendation is to continue the current trajectory.

Reflections/Notes:

This assessment measure and rubric represent a significant change to the program, which in part was driven by student and graduate feedback. The program has developed 4 capstone project types, which students can select. However, to keep consistency, a select number of criteria were developed to be COMMON across all project-specific rubrics.

Substantiating Evidence:

 PSLO5_Obj2a_Evidence_June2022.pdf (Adobe Acrobat Document)

- ▼ **Measure:** Objective 5.2b - Synthesize information from credible and relevant sources for an applied purpose.

Program level Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Graduate Survey, Question 5E
Collected at the conclusion of the spring semester by program coordinator.

Acceptable Target:

No less than a mean score of 3.25 on a 5-point scale.

Findings for Objective 5.2b - Synthesize information from credible and relevant sources for an applied purpose.

Summary of Findings:

Met benchmark, 4.75 score on 5.0 scale.

Results :

Acceptable Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations:


This is a new plan. With a small data set

(n=4), it will take some time before patterns will be noticeable. Will monitor across additional years, but so far the results are encouraging.

Reflections/Notes:

So far it is encouraging that program graduates recognize their achievement of the specific PSLO as a result of completing the program.

Substantiating Evidence:

 PSLO5_Obj2b_Evidence_June2022.pdf (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Overall Recommendations

Overall, the new assessment plan that went into effect in Fall 2021 demonstrates alignment between the PLSOs and selected measures. There is a mix of direct and indirect measures and course-specific and program-wide measures. Also it was intentional to have measures span the continuum of the program as that provides insight into how students progress across time. No changes recommended regarding PSLOs or selected measures at this time.

The program is smaller and so the n values are low. Will need to be patient as more data must be collected to recognize patterns that affirm program strengths and highlight areas for improvement. Will continue to monitor and look for patterns.

Overall Reflection

The outcome of the first run of the new program assessment plan is positive. The plan demonstrates the integration of measurable outcomes aligned with the program curriculum. It has shifted away from using GPA, course grades, and time-to-graduation as measures. The new measures are granular enough to pinpoint specific areas of strength and where improvement is needed. Across time, as measure show consistent meeting of the benchmark, me measures or higher benchmarks will be identified.

Faculty Collaboration

When the new plan was formulated, the program coordinator (who is the only non-adjunct faculty in the program), collaborated with the two adjuncts regarding the revised PSLOs and what measure would be most appropriate for each PSLO. The adjuncts provided feedback, which enhanced the new assessment plan.

Revising the plan also opened up communication about the curriculum and provided opportunities for revision and improved alignment.

The two adjuncts along with two other individuals will be part of the newly formed MHS Assessment Group. Forming this group establishes a formal effort to discuss assessment results. The group will review recent assessment cycles, reflect on their implications, and discuss strengths and opportunities for improvement. Minutes will be taken during the meeting, which will serve as a historical record as the plan evolves.

Communication & Collaboration with Students

PSLOs are provided on the public program website.

In syllabi and D2L, most faculty graphically represent the PSLOs using a table that shows the alignment of PSLOs with the course learning outcomes. Some course assessments or rubrics explicitly indicate which PSLO it is linked to.

When oriented to the online courses (MHS is 100% online), students are made aware of the meaning of PSLOs and why they are presented to students via the syllabus and D2L. The WHY includes: to demonstrate to students the careful design of the program curriculum (commitment to quality), inform students of the long-range goals of their MHS learning experience (big picture view), and increase motivation for learning (goal setting).

Also, program graduates, through the graduate survey, are asked to rate the extent to which the program helped them to achieve the PSLOs. They have opportunities to provide additional comments in addition to assigning ratings.

Program graduates are also part of the newly formed MHS Assessment Group. One representative completed the certificate program and another completed the master's degree program. A current student representative has not been incorporated into the Assessment Group yet. The smaller enrollment of this graduate program makes me concerned (as the program coordinator) about keeping student performance and survey data confidential. Adding a student to the Assessment Group will continue to be evaluated.

I'll add too that informal student communication about PSLOs and program curriculum occurs frequently. Such conversations were a key driver of the recent PSLO and curriculum revisions (effective Fall 2021).

Communication & Collaboration with External Stakeholders

Because the program does not have programmatic accreditation, receive Perkins funding, nor does it prepare graduates for a professional license a smaller and more intimate Assessment Group was designed rather than an advisor board. The Assessment Group includes a range of stakeholders (faculty, alumni, and individuals with extensive health professions education and health care administration experience).

In a variety of ways, community members (individuals not affiliated with Washburn) participate in aspects of program assessment as they serve on capstone committees and mentor students during internships. These participation opportunities facilitate communication about program outcomes, expectations, and curriculum.

WU administrators gain knowledge about assessment practices because they must sign off on program changes (like new PSLOs) and they are integrated into the University Assessment Committee's feedback loop.

All in all, many stakeholders are engaged in learning about or communicating about the MHS program assessment practices.

Communication & Collaboration with University

There is one single non-adjunct faculty in the MHS program. This person also serves as the program coordinator and drives all assessment practices. As the program coordinator, I have a history of participating in CTEL events like the assessment extravaganza, attending assessment workshops regarding Taskstream, and watching recorded assessment workshops about communicating plans and findings effectively. My attainment of the Certificate of Teaching and Learning from CTEL across many years also has contributed to my knowledge of learner and program assessment practices.

The two adjuncts have extensive assessment experience. One adjunct was the director of Washburn's assessment for many years. The other adjunct has program assessment experience through a prior position. She played a key role in attaining initial program assessment for an allied health program at Washburn in 2018. While I cannot require they attend or participate in CTEL or Assessment activities, they do receive WU email communication about such offerings.

In terms of communicating with government structures, when necessary the program has moved through the proper channels to attain approval before changes to program curriculum, PSLOs, course descriptions, and timing of course offerings were made. This included communicating with the Chair of Allied Health, SAS Curriculum and Policy committee, and SAS Faculty Council.

Last Modified: 08/16/2022 01:21:22 PM CST