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| **Program Student Learning Outcome Assessed** | **Assessment Method(s)** | **Summary Assessment Results for Each Method** | **Use of Results for Continuous Improvement** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SLO #3 (from assessment plan)** - Students will use advanced technical writing skills at a level high enough to effectively demonstrate: (a) a thorough understanding of discipline-specific knowledge and skills, and (b) positive contributions to patient care. | *Applied Technical Writing Assignment*—This is a new assessment (that was added to the revised assessment plan last spring). During their final professional semester, students enroll in a capstone course designed to integrate and refine discipline-specific knowledge and skills. The writing assignment presents students with a real-world scenario in which they must evaluate a problem, determine a range of possible solutions, and then describe (and defend) the implementation of the optimal solution. The writing assignment has a set of directions and a departmentally-modified rubric similar to the AAC&U VALUE written communication, critical thinking, and problem-solving rubrics (assignment directions and the Applied Technical Writing Rubric are attached).  Capstone course instructors rate all student assignments at both the class level and program level.  **Program and student-level targets:**  80% of students will average 3.0 (Milestone 3) or higher on the three written communication criteria on the Applied Technical Writing Rubric (see the attached rubric for written communication performance descriptors). | During the fall semester of 2019 and spring semester of 2020, 52 students completed the *Applied Technical Writing Assignment* (25 in the fall, and 27 in the spring).  The target of success for each student for written communication was to have an average score of 3.0 (Milestone 3 on the rubric) or higher across the three written communication criteria. The rubric (submitted with this report) describes the performance levels for each criterion that measures student learning outcome #3.  Student scores on each criterion were recorded and averaged into a written communication score. Summary results for both classes are presented below.   |  | Descriptive Statistics | | | | | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | n | Range | Mean | Median | Mode | | WC 1 | 52 | 2 - 4 | 3.3 | 3 | 4 | | WC 2 | 52 | 2 - 4 | 3.4 | 3 | 4 | | WC 3 | 52 | 2 - 4 | 3.4 | 3 | 4 | | SLO #3 | 52 | 2.3 – 4.0 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.3 | | *Notes.*WC = Written communication | | | | | | | Faculty met to review the data. Discussions followed about how well students performed on each written communication criterion and how they performed overall.  For student learning outcome #3 (written communication), the program met the desired target of 80% of students averaging 3.0 or higher (88% met the target). Data confirms faculty perceptions that overall students have been doing quite well in the area of written communication—especially technical writing. The curriculum and instruction appears to be meeting student needs. A decision was made to raise the bar and set the target at 85%. Faculty feel this will encourage refinement of the curriculum, especially for written communication criteria 1 and 3. |
| One year after graduation, program alumni are given a supplemental survey asking how well they feel they have achieved each student learning outcome. Students rated their technical writing skills on a scale of 1 to 4, with 4 being the highest.  **Program and student-level targets:**  80% of students will rate their technical writing skills at a 3 or higher. | During the spring 2020 semester, 35 alumni responded to the survey. 25 students rated their technical writing skills at 3 and above, 5 students rated their skills at a 4 and 5 students rated their skills at a 1. Therefore the program met the target with 30 out of 35 students (85.7%) rating their skills in the desired range. | Faculty convened to discuss alumni survey results. Since the targets were met, no changes will be made at this time. The program will continue to collect and aggregate results over time. Student confidence in their writing abilities is important and will continue to be monitored. |
| If more than one method is reported for this SLO, what conclusions can be drawn from the **results taken together?** | Both methods help solidify that the program is meeting its targets when it comes to student writing skills. Both faculty and students are rating these skills similarly. | |

| **Program Student Learning Outcome Assessed** | **Assessment Method(s)** | **Summary Assessment Results for Each Method** | **Use of Results for Continuous Improvement** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SLO #5 (from assessment plan)** - Students will demonstrate advanced problem-solving/critical thinking competencies by effectively applying and carrying out the problem-solving process in real-world settings. | *Applied Technical Writing Assignment*—This is a new assessment (that was added to the revised assessment plan last spring). During their final professional semester, students enroll in a capstone course designed to integrate and refine discipline-specific knowledge and skills. The writing assignment presents students with a real-world scenario in which they must evaluate a problem, determine a range of possible solutions, and then describe (and defend) the implementation of the optimal solution. The writing assignment has a set of directions and a departmentally-modified rubric similar to the AAC&U VALUE written communication, critical thinking, and problem-solving rubrics (assignment directions and the Applied Technical Writing Rubric are attached).  Capstone course instructors rate all student assignments at both the class level and program level.  **Program and student-level targets:**  80% of students will average 3.0 (Milestone 3) or higher on the three written communication criteria on the Applied Technical Writing Rubric (see the attached rubric for written communication performance descriptors). | During the fall semester of 2019 and spring semester of 2020, 52 students completed the *Applied Technical Writing Assignment* (25 in the fall, and 27 in the spring).  The target of success for problem solving/critical thinking for each student was also set at 3.0 (Milestone 3) or higher. The rubric (submitted with this report) describes the performance levels for each criterion that measures student learning outcome #5.  Student scores on each criterion were recorded and averaged into a problem solving/critical thinking score. Summary results for both classes are presented below.   |  | Descriptive Statistics | | | | | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | n | Range | Mean | Median | Mode | | PS/CT 1 | 52 | 2 - 4 | 3.4 | 3 | 3 | | PS/CT 2 | 52 | 2 - 4 | 3.0 | 3 | 3 | | PS/CT 3 | 52 | 2 - 4 | 3.6 | 4 | 4 | | SLO #5 | 52 | 2.3 – 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | | *Notes.* PS/CT = Problem solving/critical thinking | | | | | | | Faculty met to review the data. Discussions followed about how well students performed on each problem solving criterion and how they performed overall.  Student performance on learning outcome #5 was more varied, with average performance on each criterion ranging from 3.0 to 3.6. Criterion 2 was the lowest, with the average just meeting our target of 3.0. We are doing very well on criteria 1 and 3. Faculty discussed where in the curriculum we could address criterion 2. The plan is to modify the second professional applications course to emphasize problem solving and critical thinking. Problem solving in the field will be modeled, and additional practice opportunities will be provided. An assignment will be created to formatively assess students’ problem-solving skills, with a focus on criterion 2. This should lead to students performing better on criterion 2 when they have to complete the *Applied Technical Writing* assignment. |
| One year after graduation, program alumni are given a supplemental survey asking how well they feel they have achieved each student learning outcome. Students rated their critical thinking skills on a scale of 1 to 4, with 4 being the highest.  **Program and student-level targets:**  80% of students will rate their critical thinking skills at a 3 or higher. | During the spring 2020 semester, 35 alumni responded to the survey. 30 students rated their critical thinking skills at 3 and above, 3 students rated their skills at a 4 and 2 students rated their skills at a 1. Therefore the program met the target with 33 out of 35 students (94.3%) rating their skills in the desired range. | Faculty convened to discuss alumni survey results. Since the targets were met, no changes will be made at this time. The program will continue to collect and aggregate results over time. Student confidence in their critical thinking abilities is important and will continue to be monitored. |
| If more than one method is reported for this SLO, what conclusions can be drawn from the **results taken together**? | Both methods help solidify that the program is meeting its targets when it comes to student critical thinking skills. Both faculty and students are rating these skills similarly. | |
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