

**Course Assessment Report**  
**Washtenaw Community College**

Discipline	Course Number	Title
Physical Therapist Assistant	240	PTA 240 07/06/2017-Clinical Education II
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Health Sciences	Allied Health	Kathleen Cook
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

**I. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome**

Outcome 1: Interact with other health care professionals and patients in a professional and ethical manner.

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Clinical Assessment Tool for PTA 240, Ques #1, #6
  - Assessment Date: Fall 2008
  - Course section(s)/other population: all
  - Number students to be assessed: all
  - How the assessment will be scored:
  - Standard of success to be used for this assessment:
  - Who will score and analyze the data:

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2016, 2015, 2014		

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
51	51

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

All students were assessed.
-----------------------------

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

There is only one section of this course for all students. All students were assessed each year.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

The tool used to assess this outcome is the American Physical Therapy Association's (APTA) Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI). This tool was revised/updated in 2011. There are 14 clinical areas that are assessed using this tool. For outcome #1, areas 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 were assessed. This covers clinical safety, communication, ethical and legal areas related to clinical performance. Students in this clinical in years 2014 and 2015 were expected to achieve Advanced Intermediate in these areas. In 2016, the benchmark was revised where the students were to achieve Intermediate in all 14 areas assessed by the CPI. The goal with this revision was to decrease confusion that clinical instructors expressed in the grading expectations of having 2 levels (Advanced Intermediate for areas 1-6 and Intermediate for areas 7-14). A table was used to document and calculate the number of students who met this benchmark in each area. The yearly percentage was then calculated as well as a 3-year average to assess the standard of success for this outcome.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

2014: 15/18 students (83%) met the benchmarks in these areas of the CPI. It is noted that one clinical instructor consistently scored the student low in all areas, however, in talking with this instructor regarding student progress they thought they were doing very well and there were no concerns.

2015: 10/14 students (71%) met the benchmarks in these areas of the CPI. It was noted that one clinical instructor (same as above) seemed to consistently score low in all areas.

2016: 18/19 (95%) of students met the benchmarks in these areas. This was the first year that the benchmark for students in all 14 areas of the CPI was revised to Intermediate. This had been in discussion for a few years with the PTA Advisory Committee and clinical instructors to decrease confusion in grading/performance

expectations and definitions in appropriately scoring the CPI for this level of clinical.

The 3-year average related to the standard of success of 80% of the students reaching 80% of the benchmarks related to this outcome was 84%. The standard of success for this 3-year period was achieved.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

The standard of success was achieved for this outcome. The strength of student achievement for this outcome during this assessment period is fair. In review of the data each year since the revision of the Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) in 2011, there was concern on confusion and accuracy of the grading of student performance based on the benchmarks established for this course. It appears that the concerns were warranted based on the percentage of students achieving the benchmarks in 2015 (83%) and (71%). There are other variables that seem to have had some impact as well. This includes potential clinical instructor subjectivity and lack of understanding of category definitions.

In 2016 the grading/student achievement of benchmarks was "streamlined." This was done based on observation of the student achievement over the past several years, and feedback from the PTA Advisory Committee, Clinical Instructors as well as students.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

While the standard of success was achieved, from analysis of the data from the past 3 years as well as feedback, making the adjustment in the grading/student expectations was a key change. In discussions with clinical instructors, especially after the expectations were streamlined, they expressed less confusion and more realistic expectations for the students at this level of clinical experience. This is evident based on the percentage of students achieving outcome benchmarks between 2014-2015, and (ACCE) then the large improvement noted in 2016. The Academic Coordinator for Clinical Education, the instructor for all Clinical Education Courses, has also placed more emphasis on how to properly score the CPI to clinical instructors through the annual clinical instructor orientation and 1:1 as appropriate. The ACCE has dedicated more time in student orientation on student expectations for this clinical course as well. It should be noted that the APTA requires all students and clinical instructors to complete an online training session on the CPI, including passing a test prior to being able to utilize the assessment tool.

Outcome 2: Safely practice Physical Therapy Interventions as delegated with close supervision.

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Clinical Assessment Tool for PTA 240, Ques #3, #4, #5, #6
  - Assessment Date: Fall 2008
  - Course section(s)/other population: all
  - Number students to be assessed: all
  - How the assessment will be scored:
  - Standard of success to be used for this assessment:
  - Who will score and analyze the data:

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2016, 2015, 2014		

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
51	51

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

All students were assessed.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

There is only one section of PTA 240. Each year all students were included in the assessment.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

The tool used to assess this outcome is the American Physical Therapy Association's (APTA) Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI). This tool was revised/updated in 2011. There are 14 clinical areas that are assessed using

this tool. For outcome #2, areas 1, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 14 were assessed. These areas assess student performance in safety and technical skill areas related to this outcome. Students in this clinical in years 2014 and 2015 were expected to achieve Advanced Intermediate in area 1 and Intermediate in the other areas. In 2016, the benchmark was revised where the students were to achieve Intermediate in all 14 areas assessed by the CPI. The goal with this revision was to decrease confusion that clinical instructors expressed in the grading expectations of having 2 levels (Advanced Intermediate for areas 1-6 and Intermediate for areas 7-14). A table was used to document and calculate the number of students who met this benchmark in each area. The yearly percentage was then calculated as well as a 3-year average to assess the standard of success for this outcome.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

2014: 13/18 (72%) of students achieved the benchmarks for this outcome. One clinical instructor tends to consistently score low. There was a new clinical instructor. Others who didn't meet the benchmark had limited exposure in some areas. It is also noted that students tended to score lower in area 7 (clinical reasoning).

2015: 11/14 (79%) of students achieved the benchmarks for this outcome. As noted above, there is one clinical instructor who consistently scores low. Also, it was found that in one student assessment, all marks were just below the benchmarks. This is an online tool and some have reported difficulty "putting the mark" where they want at times. Item 1 (safety) was often rated using the Intermediate benchmark, instead of the Advanced Intermediate benchmark as it should have been. This confusion has been a concern of the instructor, PTA Advisory Committee and clinical instructors over this assessment period. This prompted the revision of grading/student expectations beginning in 2016.

2016: 19/19 (100%) of students achieved the benchmarks for this outcome. As noted above, the benchmark for students was revised from Advanced Intermediate in items 1-6 and Intermediate for items 7-14 to Intermediate for all items 1-14. Initial feedback from clinical instructors and students has been very positive to this change.

Overall the 3-year average from 2014-2016 was that 82% of the students achieved the standard of success for this outcome. The standard of success that 80% of the students achieve 80% of the benchmarks related to this outcome was met.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Based on review of the data over the past 3 years, the strength of student achievement is fair to low. In 2014 (72%) and in 2015 (79%), the students did not achieve the standard of success. However, in 2016, 100% of the students achieved the standard of success. There could be several reasons for this. As noted with outcome #1, there seems to be some confusion over grading/student expectations as there were two tiers (Advanced Intermediate for items 1-6 and Intermediate for items 7-14). While most of the areas for this outcome fell in the Intermediate area, area 1 (safety) was consistently scored at Intermediate in those students who did not make the standard. In 2016 this was not an issue. There are other areas to always watch related to student achievement, and these include clinical instructor subjectivity in grading and student understanding of performance expectations.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

The first area of improvement was implemented during this assessment period. The grading/student performance benchmarks were revised to Intermediate for all CPI items 1-14. This appears to have made a very significant positive change as evidenced by the improvement from the 2014 and 2015 rates of success, 72% and 79% respectively, to 100% success in 2016. Other areas of improvement will be continued emphasis on clearly defining what the benchmarks mean in terms of clinical performance, and in areas where patient exposure may be low, educating the clinical instructors on ways of providing alternative learning activities to meet the performance expectations.

Outcome 3: Accurately document the interventions performed, and patient response to those interventions, using SOAP (Subjective, Objective, Assessment, Plan) format or format per facility guidelines.

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Clinical Assessment Tool for PTA 240, Ques #2
  - Assessment Date: Fall 2008
  - Course section(s)/other population: all
  - Number students to be assessed: all
  - How the assessment will be scored:
  - Standard of success to be used for this assessment:

- Who will score and analyze the data:

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2016, 2015, 2014		

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
51	51

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

All students each year from 2014-2016 were assessed.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

There is only one section for PTA 240. All students each year were assessed.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

The tool used to assess this outcome is the American Physical Therapy Association's (APTA) Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI). This tool was revised/updated in 2011. There are 14 clinical areas that are assessed using this tool. For outcome #3, area 13 on the CPI was assessed. This area assesses student performance in documentation, which includes patient care notes and billing for patient care. Students in this clinical in years 2014-2016 were expected to achieve Intermediate in this area for all years reviewed. This area/outcome was not affected by the revision of grading and student performance benchmarks that occurred in fall of 2016. The yearly percentage was then calculated as well as a 3-year average to assess the standard of success for this outcome.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes  
 2014: 17/18 (94%) of students achieved the benchmark for this outcome.

2015: 12/14 (86%) of student achieved the benchmark for this outcome.

2016: 19/19 (100%) of students achieved the benchmark for this outcome.

Overall, the 3-year average was 94%, when related to the standard of success of 80% of the students will achieve 80% of the benchmarks for this outcome (and in this case there was only one item reviewed for this outcome). The standard of success was achieved.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

The overall strength of student achievement for learning outcome #3 is strong. While there have been many changes over the recent years concerning processes and mechanisms related to documentation of patient care in the clinic (electronic medical record systems), the students are able to apply foundational knowledge and skill for this intermediate level clinical.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Areas of improvement will continue to focus on solid documentation foundations. The program is implementing an electronic recordkeeping system for use in the classroom and labs. Other improvements include integrating more documentation activities and introducing patient billing terminology and procedures into other PTA courses prior to clinical. It is noted that while electronic records are used in the majority of facilities, clinical instructors and the PTA advisory committee emphasize that it is still very relevant that students know how to handwrite a patient care note, and if they can accomplish this, then they will be able to adapt to any electronic system.

## **II. Course Summary and Action Plans Based on Assessment Results**

1. Describe your overall impression of how this course is meeting the needs of students. Did the assessment process bring to light anything about student achievement of learning outcomes that surprised you?

Overall, this course seems to be meeting the needs of the students in their preparation to become entry level physical therapist assistants. There were no surprises in compiling the data or analyzing the data. The faculty and PTA Advisory Committee were aware that the two-tiered structure of grading/student performance needed to be monitored carefully, and due to findings prior to this assessment, adjustments were made and seem to have had a positive effect not



only on student outcomes but also in acceptance and less confusion with using the Clinical Performance Instrument.

- Describe when and how this information, including the action plan, was or will be shared with Departmental Faculty.

The Coordinator for Clinical Education will continue to share the data, outcomes and ideas for changes with the PTA faculty, PTA Advisory Committee as well as students and clinical instructors. All of the clinical instructors are PTs/PTAs who volunteer to work with the students in the PTA program. This information gets shared with them at the annual clinical instructor orientation, through emails, and 1:1 meetings with the clinical instructors when the Coordinator for Clinical Education conducts site visits to the clinics.

- Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Outcome Language	The Outcome Language in the Master Syllabus will be changed to reflect language consistent with the Clinical Performance Instrument and with Accreditation requirements as well as new grading expectations.	Master Syllabus has not been updated to reflect actual changes in the course.	2017

- Is there anything that you would like to mention that was not already captured?

5.

### III. Attached Files

[PTA 240 Data Collection Table](#)  
[List of Clinical Performance Items \(Assess. Tool\)](#)  
[PTA 240 Course Assessment Data and Analysis](#)

**Faculty/Preparer:** Kathleen Cook **Date:** 07/13/2017  
**Department Chair:** Connie Foster **Date:** 07/14/2017  
**Dean:** Valerie Greaves **Date:** 07/14/2017

**Assessment Committee Chair:** Michelle Garey **Date:** 10/18/2017

**COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT**

**I. Background Information**

1. Course assessed:  
 Course Discipline Code and Number: PTA 240  
 Course Title: Clinical Education II  
 Division/Department Codes: Math, Science, Health
  
2. Semester assessment was conducted (check one):  
 Fall 20\_\_  
 Winter 2012\_\_  
 Spring/Summer 20\_\_
  
3. Assessment tool(s) used: check all that apply.  
 Portfolio  
 Standardized test  
 Other external certification/licensure exam (specify):  
 Survey  
 Prompt  
 Departmental exam  
 Capstone experience (specify):  
 Other (specify): APTA Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI)
  
4. Have these tools been used before?  
 Yes  
 No

If yes, have the tools been altered since its last administration? If so, briefly describe changes made.

5. Indicate the number of students assessed and the total number of students enrolled in the course.  
 2008 = 9/13 students  
 2009 = 10/17  
 2010 = 10/17  
 Total Assessed = 47 students over a 3 year period
  
6. If all students were not assessed, describe how students were selected for the assessment. *(Include your sampling method and rationale.)*  
 Student's Clinical Performance Instruments were randomly selected for each year.

**II. Results**

1. Briefly describe the changes that were implemented in the course as a result of the previous assessment.  
 There were no changes implemented in the course as this is the first 3 year review for this course.

Note: The assessment tool that was initially developed for this course was not endorsed by CAPTE, the accrediting body for PTA Education. Utilizing the Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) was strongly recommended. This occurred after the initial master syllabus was written and approved.

2. List each outcome that was assessed for this report exactly as it is stated on the course master syllabus. *(You can copy and paste these from CurricUNET's WR report.)*
  1. Interact with other health care professionals and patients in a professional and ethical manner.
  2. Safely practice Physical Therapy Interventions as delegated with close supervision.
  3. Accurately document the interventions performed, patient response to those interventions, using SPOAP (Subjective, Objective, Assessment, Plan) format or format per facility guidelines.
  
3. For each outcome that was assessed, indicate the standard of success exactly as it is stated on the course master syllabus. *(You can copy and paste these from CurricUNET's WR report.)*

*logged 6/12/12 syv*

COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT

The overall Standard of success for PTA 240, from the original Master Syllabus, is 75% of the students in this course, each year, will receive a "satisfactory" evaluation from their Clinical Instructor." This, again, was based on the original assessment tool. For the Clinical Performance Instrument, the revised standards of success for each outcome are as follows.

Outcome #1: Students will achieve "Entry Level" (90% or higher) on CPI items #2, 3, 4, 5.

Outcome #2: Students will achieve "Entry Level" (90% or higher) on CPI items #1 and 50% or higher on CPI items 9, 10, 12.

Outcome #3: Student ~~would~~ <sup>will</sup> achieve 50% or higher on CPI items # 6 and 7.

4. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected during the course assessment. Indicate the extent to which students are achieving each of the learning outcomes listed above and state whether the standard of success was met for each outcome. **In a separate document, include a summary of the data collected and any rubrics or scoring guides used for the assessment.**

For the criterion reviewed for outcome #1, 94% of the students assessed met the standard of success for this outcome. It is noted that in 2009, there was one student who did not meet the benchmark in all of these areas. This is also true for 2010.

For outcome #2, criterion items #1, 9, 10, and 12 were reviewed. For each criterion, over a 3-year period, 89% of the students met the established benchmark.

For outcome #3, criterion items #6 and & 7 were reviewed. For item #6, 100% of the students over a 3-year period achieved the established benchmark for the course and the standard of success for this outcome. And for item #7, 100% of the students over a 3-year period achieved the established benchmark.

5. Describe the areas of strength and weakness in students' achievement of the learning outcomes shown in the assessment results. (This should be an interpretation of the assessment results described above and a thoughtful analysis of student performance.)

Strengths: Overall professionalism (accountability, responsibility, legal and ethical behavior) by the students, as indicated in CPI items 2-5, is very strong. Students are also performing/demonstrating technical skills and patient interventions at, or above the expected level for this intermediate clinical experience. Narrative comments related to these areas reflected the markings and were overall positive.

While not part of the standards of success and outcomes, it is noted that in the area of critical thinking (Criterion #11), 96% of the students scored above the benchmarks. At this intermediate stage of clinical development, this is quite strong.

Weaknesses: In reviewing the data and related narrative comments, weakness ~~were~~ <sup>was</sup> noted in the area of Outcome #1, Safety, for all 3 years observed. Upon review of the CPIs, the reasons were due to inconsistent use of the gait belt and students requiring more verbal cueing for consistent safe behavior. There were no critical incidents related to safety.

Overall, in reviewing the data for all 20 criterion in the CPI, there are 5 areas ~~were~~ <sup>h</sup> students (1-2 per year) did not receive enough exposure to warrant a mark. These particular areas are related to patient management areas, outside of direct patient care responsibilities. These skills are in the early to mid stages of developing at this point. In 2009, it is noted that one student in particular fell in this area. This was more related again to the particular setting this student was in.

III. Changes influenced by assessment results

1. If weaknesses were found (see above) or students did not meet expectations, describe the action that will be taken to address these weaknesses. (If students met all expectations, describe your plan for continuous improvement.)

COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT

Safety is taught throughout the PTA curriculum. Safety expectations are being emphasized more in lecture and lab situations, including practice time and testing. Students are graded in safety for all check offs and practicals. More time related to safety is spent in clinical education orientation, prior to each clinical.

While some clinics for this particular clinical, for the years assessed, were not able to provide some enough exposure to patient management area (example: delegation to support personnel), these are usually unique circumstances to these particular clinics. These clinics are more outpatient based and do not have support personnel on staff. Facilities are strongly encouraged to look for other ways students could achieve more exposure in these areas. The Academic Coordinator for Clinical Education has had discussions with those facilities. These clinics do provide comprehensive exposure to a diverse patient population allowing students sufficient opportunity to practice and develop their skills as PTAs.

- 2. Identify intended changes that will be instituted based on results of this assessment activity (check all that apply). Please describe changes and give rationale for change.
a. x Outcomes/Assessments on the Master Syllabus
Change/rationale: To reflect the new Clinical Performance instrument that was implemented in 2011.
b. x Objectives/Evaluation on the Master Syllabus
Change/rationale: To reflect the new Clinical Performance instrument that was implemented in 2011
c. x Course pre-requisites on the Master Syllabus
Change/rationale: PTA 240 is now offered at the same time students are enrolled in PTA 225 and PTA 198
d. x 1st Day Handouts
Change/rationale: To reflect changes related to the new Clinical Performance Instrument that was implemented in 2011.
e. [ ] Course assignments
Change/rationale:
f. x Course materials (check all that apply)
x Textbook
[ ] Handouts
[ ] Other:
g. [ ] Instructional methods
Change/rationale:
h. [ ] Individual lessons & activities
Change/rationale:
3. What is the timeline for implementing these actions? The Clinical Performance Instrument, through the APTA, was revised in 2010/2011. It is now an online tool.

IV. Future plans

- 1. Describe the extent to which the assessment tools used were effective in measuring student achievement of learning outcomes for this course. The assessment tools used for PTA 240 were very effective. They looked at all of outcome areas as written in the Master Syllabus, and provides a comprehensive, objective view of the student's clinical progress.
2. If the assessment tools were not effective, describe the changes that will be made for future assessments.
3. Which outcomes from the master syllabus have been addressed in this report?
All X Selected
If "All", provide the report date for the next full review: Fall 2014
If "Selected", provide the report date for remaining outcomes:

**COURSE ASSESSMENT REPORT**

**Submitted by:**

Print: Kathleen A Cook Faculty/Preparer Signature: Kathleen A Cook Date: 5.17.12.

Print: Connie Foster Department Chair Signature: Connie Foster Date: 5/30/12

Print: Martha A. Showalter Dean/Administrator Signature: Martha Showalter Date: 6/6/12