

Doisy College of Health Sciences Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program: Physical Therapy	Department: Physical Therapy and Athletic Training
Degree or Certificate Level: DPT	College/School: Doisy College of Health Sciences
Date (Month/Year): September 2020	Primary Assessment Contact: Randy R Richter
In what year/cycle was the data upon which this report is based collected? 2019-2020	
In what year/cycle was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated?	

1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

PLO #3: Apply principles of evidence-based practice in patient care
PLO #4: Evaluate typical versus atypical physical movement

2. Assessment Methods: Student Artifacts

Which student artifacts were used to determine if students achieved this outcome? Please identify the course(s) in which these artifacts were collected. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

PLO #3: Rating on Clinical Performance Instrument – Item 12 – Plan of care (DPT 5291 Clinical Rotation1A; DPT 6192 Clinical Rotation 2B; DPT 6293 Clinical Experience III [Note, due to COVID -19 restrictions related to clinical experiences, DPT 6293 was used for this year's assessment. Next year, we will return to our standard procedure and use DPT 6294 Clinical Experience IV for assessment. All clinical experience courses occur at clinical sites.

PLO #4: – Video analysis single joint assignment (DPT 5123 Clinical Gait). This course was offered on site and in-person.

No Madrid artifacts were included

3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process

What process was used to evaluate the student artifacts, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and include them in/with this report.

PLO 3: A Department Administrative Assistant prepared a spreadsheet of the Clinical Performance Instrument ratings. Rating data was analyzed by the faculty member serving as division lead for the Students / Outcomes Division, Program in Physical Therapy. The data was used to assess student achievement as per the assessment rubric.

PLO 4: The course coordinator for DPT 5123 Clinical Gait provided de-identified assignment data for the analysis of gait (walking). Data was analyzed by the faculty member serving as division lead for the Students / Outcomes Division, Program in Physical Therapy. The data was used to assess student achievement as per the assessment rubric.

4. Data/Results

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcomes? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

PLO 3:

Assessment tool: Rating on Clinical Performance Instrument – Rating on Clinical Performance Instrument – Item 12 – Apply principles of evidence-based practice in patient care, for the respective courses. (DPT cohort 2020)

Results of the assessment: 25% of ratings in the course will be reviewed, with an average of 85% achieving a ranking of “master” or higher using the corresponding assessment rubric. (met)

The goal was met for this PLO.

PLO 4:

Assessment tool: Assignments requiring analysis of gait (walking)

Results of the assessment: 25% of ratings in the course will be reviewed, with an average of 85% achieving a ranking of “master” or higher using the corresponding assessment rubric (met)

The goal was met for this PLO.

5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you?

PLO 3:

Across the 3 courses students show improvement over time. From the first course, DPT 5291, to the last course, there is a shift from Reinforce to Mastery. At the end of final course, DPT 6193, 96% students were performing at the Master level. (Based on all students with a rating across the 3 courses)

PLO 4:

Students complete 4 assignments analyzing an aspect of gait (walking). The first 3 assignments require analysis of different joints of the lower limb (e.g. foot and ankle). The 4th assignment is comprehensive. For the 4th assignment 97% of the students were performing at the Master level

6. Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of Current Assessment Findings

A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss these results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

Data will be analyzed in the at a fall 2020 or spring 2021 faculty meeting. Possible changes and/or additions will be discussed at that time.

B. How specifically have you decided to use findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Course content• Teaching techniques• Improvements in technology• Prerequisites | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Course sequence• New courses• Deletion of courses• Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings |
| Changes to the Assessment Plan | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Student learning outcomes• Student artifacts collected• Evaluation process | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics)• Data collection methods• Frequency of data collection |

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of the findings.

PLO #3 and PLO #4: At this time, no further action is anticipated.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

Students are achieving the desired outcomes.

7. Closing the Loop: Review of Previous Assessment Findings and Changes

A. What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years as a result of assessment data?

Although not specifically related to the PLO #4 assessment, program faculty are piloting placing the introduction of movement analysis earlier in the professional phase of the curriculum. This change has been implemented for fall 2020. Since performance on the gait (walking) analysis assignments are typically high, it is not clear if this assessment mechanism is specific enough to show the impact of introducing movement analysis earlier in the professional phase of the curriculum.

B. How has this change/have these changes been assessed?

Faculty will need to determine how to assess the pilot change in the introduction of movement analysis earlier in the professional phase of the curriculum.

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

At this time the assessment of introducing movement analysis earlier in the professional phase of the curriculum has not occurred.

D. How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

Outcomes will be continually reviewed, along with different outcomes required by the specific accrediting body of the Program in Physical Therapy. Currently, the program enjoys a 100% employment rate and has shown improvement in the National Physical Therapy Examination pass rate.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools and/or revised/updated assessment plans along with this report.

All assignment instructions and rubrics are attached to the Assessment plan.