

**College of Health Professions  
Annual Assessment Report  
2016-2017**

## **Introduction**

The College of Health Professions (CHP) Assessment Plan was developed in the spring of 2016 to assess the CHP student learning outcomes (SLOs) which were developed and approved in the spring 2015. The student learning outcomes were developed based on the CHP mission statement and core values. The mission statement, core values, and student learning outcomes are included on the CHP website

(<http://www.sacredheart.edu/media/sacredheart/collegeofhealthprofessions/CHP-Assessment-Plan-8-19-16.pdf>).

The CHP committee is following the assessment calendar outlined in the assessment plan available at the link above. Thus, the SLO, “Apply ethical principles in approaches to learning, research, and practice” (hereafter, Ethics SLO), was assessed during the 2016-2017 academic year. The rubric used to assess the Ethics SLO is included in Appendix A.

### **College Assessment Committee**

The CHP Assessment Committee includes representation across departments and programs. CHP Assessment Committee members for 2016-2017 included: Jody Bortone (Occupational Therapy), Steve Burrows (Health Science & Leadership), Robin Danzak (Speech Language Pathology), Bev Fein (Physical Therapy), Anna Greer (Exercise Science), Christina Gunther (Global Health Programs), and Gail Samdperil (Athletic Training). Dr. Anna Greer chaired the committee. Eric Nemec (Physician’s Assistant) and Alicja Stannard (Exercise Science) will join the committee in the fall, 2017.

## **Assessment Methods**

### **Assessment Preparation**

During the pre-fall period of the 2016-2017 academic year, the Assessment Chair contacted the CHP Program Directors to ensure that the artifacts for the Ethics SLO were still relevant. (Note: All artifacts were chosen during a curriculum mapping process conducted when the Assessment Plan was developed). Once artifacts were confirmed, Program Directors were asked to request their instructors save the assignment instructions for the artifact and all copies of the submitted artifact. Instructors were also asked to indicate the highest and lowest quality assignments.

The Assessment Chair then created an assessment calendar for the 2016-2017 academic year (Appendix B). The Assessment Chair collected the assignment artifacts according to the 2016-2017 assessment calendar. Once artifacts were collected, the Assessment Chair distributed the highest quality, lowest quality, and five randomly selected artifacts to the appropriate Assessment Team pairs for evaluation. (Note: The CHP Assessment Committee was broken down into pairs for the assessment process.)

### **Assessment Process**

Each member of the Assessment Team Pair evaluated the selected artifacts on their own using the appropriate rubric for the SLO(s) being assessed. Once evaluated, the team reconciled any differences in scores assigned and created an Assessment report for the Program being evaluated. The report included average scores on the Ethics rubric criteria and outlined strengths and opportunities. The Assessment Team Pair then sent an electronic copy of the report to the Director of the program for which the Ethics SLO was assessed.

### **Closing the Loop**

The Program being assessed used a standard Assessment Response form to provide their response to the assessment results. The form required programs to outline strategies that will be used to address the opportunities identified by the assessment team. The form also required the program to indicate a timeline, and faculty responsible for each strategy. The Assessment Response form was submitted to the Assessment Chair.

### **Assessment Results**

The assessment results are presented separately for undergraduates and graduates as the target scores for these two groups differ. Specifically, the goal is that graduate students earn a score of 4 or higher on the rubric and that undergraduates earn a score of 3 or higher on the rubric. The detailed assessment reports for each program can be provided upon request (greera@sacredheart.edu).

### **Graduate Programs**

Table 1 includes the average scores earned overall by graduate students as well as the average scores earned by each graduate program. As shown in Table 1, all program showed opportunity for improvements in their scores.

*Table 1. Graduate Program Assessment Results, Average Scores for all Ethics Criteria (2016-2017)*

Ethics Criteria*	Graduate Overall	MSEXN	DPT	OT	SLP
Ethical Self-Awareness	2.41	NO	2.68	NO	2.14
Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	2.51	2.71	2.64	2.68	2.0
Ethical Issue Recognition	2.59	2.1	2.45	3.3	2.50
Application of Ethical Perspectives	2.75	2.8	2.77	2.77	2.64
Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives	2.90	2.9	2.82	3.32	2.57

NO=not observed, MSEXN=Master of Exercise Science and Nutrition, DPT = Doctor of Physical Therapy, OT+ Occupational Therapy, SLP=Speech, Language Pathology

\*Note: Possible range of 1-4 for all criteria

Below we provide a summary of the assessment findings for each program.

### *Masters of Exercise Science and Nutrition*

For the Masters of Exercise Science and Nutrition (MSEXN) Program, we identified an opportunity for a revision to the Ethics assignment. Specifically, the MSEXN students were able to address all of the Ethics criteria but with limited complexity. The evaluators determined that this was partially due to the wording of the questions in the assignment which did not always require students to fully explain their responses.

### *Doctor of Physical Therapy*

The Physical Therapy (DPT) students worked with the Occupational Therapy (OT) students to work through case studies. The model used, the RIPS Model, provided a useful tool to allow students to apply ethical principles. The assignment, however, did not include questions that allowed for complex responses that aligned with the ethics SLO rubric. The low average scores also reflect the short answer nature of the assignment which did not invite the amount of reflection necessary for students to demonstrate a high level of competency.

### *Occupational Therapy*

The Occupational Therapy (OT) students were able to identify the ethical and legal issues provided within the cases. However, there were some issues with the assignment used. Specifically, the assignment was based on the RIPS, which is a Physical Therapy model rather than a model used across multiple health professions. The RIPS model does not include ethical reasoning criteria typically found in higher education ethical reasoning models (e.g., self-reflection, analysis of consequences, etc.). The evaluators recommended expanding the assignment format to make sure all ethics criteria are addressed in the assignment.

### *Speech Language Pathology*

The Speech Language Pathology (SLP) program required students to use a real ethics case that they had experienced. While the assignment was a useful one, the evaluators recommended some changes to the assignment to give SLP students the opportunity to demonstrate competency on all of the Ethics criteria. Specifically, the evaluators suggested that the assignment instructions should request students to include a self-reflection of their own values and their impact on the case. In addition, the instructions should clarify that students name, explain, and apply multiple theories in the instructions.

### **Undergraduate Programs**

Table 2 includes the average scores earned overall by undergraduate students as well as the average scores earned by each undergraduate program. As shown in Table 2, most of the ethical criteria were “not observed” in the artifacts chosen for assessment. The artifacts chosen by each of the programs appeared to be useful assignments; however, they did not allow the evaluators to determine if the Ethics criteria were achieved. Thus, the evaluators recommended

that each of these programs choose a new assignment or add on to an existing assignment for the next round of Assessment for Ethics.

Table 2. Undergraduate Program Assessment Results, Average Scores for all Ethics Criteria (2016-2017)

Ethics Criteria*	Undergraduate Overall	EX	HS	AT
Ethical Self-Awareness	NO	NO	NO	NO
Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	NO	NO	NO	NO
Ethical Issue Recognition	2	NO	2	NO
Application of Ethical Perspectives	2	NO	2	NO
Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives	NO	NO	NO	NO

NO=not observed, EX = Exercise Science, HS = Health Science, AT = Athletic training

\*Note: Possible range of 1-4 for all criteria

Below we provide a summary of the assessment findings for each program.

### *Exercise Science*

The Exercise Science (EX) program chose an assignment which required EX students to interview professionals in the field about an ethical issue they have faced including how they dealt with the ethical issue. While this seemed like a valuable assignment, it did not allow the evaluators to determine if the students met the Ethics SLO. This is because the students were required to report someone else's ethical perspective without giving their own. The evaluators recommended the development of a new assignment or additional questions added to the existing assignment. It might be helpful for the EX program to use the rubric as a starting point for developing the assignment.

### *Health Science*

The assignment chosen as the artifact did not require students to engage in ethical self-reflection, compare different ethical perspectives, or evaluate different ethical perspectives. The evaluators recommended the development of a new assignment or additional questions added to the existing assignment. It might be helpful for the HS program to use the rubric as a starting point for developing the assignment.

### *Athletic Training*

The assignment chosen as the artifact for the Ethics Assessment process was an Ethics quiz. The quiz examined students' ability to recognize ethical approaches and issues as well as to select the best outcome within the context of an ethical problem in Athletic Training. While this is a great assessment tool, it does not allow for examining students' ethics using the Rubric chosen for the College-Wide Assessment process. The evaluators recommended that the AT program develop an Ethics assignment which requires students to examine, analyze, and discuss ethical

issues. It might be helpful for the AT program to use the rubric as a starting point for developing the assignment.

### **Program Responses to the Assessment Results**

Each program has provided an indication of how they intend to improve their scores using the Program Response form provided to them. These detailed program responses can be included upon request (greera@sacredheart.edu). Each of the programs indicated that they will develop a new assignment or add-on to an existing assignment to allow students to demonstrate competency on all Ethics criteria. Most commonly, programs identified a need to require students to provide more complex, in-depth responses which require self-reflection about their own ethical perspectives. Several programs also identified opportunities to integrate additional ethics-based learning opportunities throughout their curriculum in order to increase Ethics rubrics scores in the future.

### **Conclusions**

This was the first SLO assessed using the CHP Assessment Plan. All of the programs identified challenges assessing all of the Ethics criteria because the assignments chosen for assessment did not always align well with the SLO rubric. The CHP assessment committee recommends that each program pilot test their chosen artifacts against the assessment rubrics in the future to ensure that the chosen assignments are appropriate for the assessment process.

When evaluators were able to use the SLO rubric, scores for the Ethics criteria showed a moderate level of competence with room for improvement in scores. Each of the programs outlined both curricular and assignment changes to improve Ethics assessment scores in the future.

## Appendix A

### ETHICAL REASONING VALUE RUBRIC

Criteria	Benchmark (1)	Milestone (2)	Milestone (3)	Capstone (4)	N.O.
Ethical Self-Awareness	Student states either their core beliefs or articulates the origins of the core beliefs but not both.	Student states both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.	Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.	Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs and discussion has greater depth and clarity.	
Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	Student only names the major theory she/he uses.	Student can name the major theory she/he uses, and is only able to present the gist of he named theory.	Student can name the major theory or theories she/he uses, can present the gist of said theory or theories and attempts to explain the details of the theory or theories used, but has some inaccuracies.	Student names the theory or theories, can present the gist of said theory or theories, and accurately explains the details of the theory or theories used.	
Ethical Issue Recognition	Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues but fails to grasp complexity or interrelationships.	Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues and grasp (incompletely) the complexities or interrelationships among the issues.	Student can recognize ethical issues when issues are presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context OR can grasp cross-relationships among the issues.	Student can recognize ethical issues when presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context AND can recognize cross-relationships among the issues.	
Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	Students can apply ethical	Student can apply ethical	Student can independently (to a	Student can independently apply	

	perspectives/concepts to an ethical question with support (using examples, in a class, in a group, or a fixed-choice setting) but is unable to apply ethical perspectives/concepts independently (to a new example).	perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, independently (to a new example) and the application is inaccurate.	new example) apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, but does not consider the specific implications of the application.	ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, and is able to consider full implications of the application.	
Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/ Concepts	Student states a position but cannot state the objectives to an assumptions and limitations of the different perspectives/concepts.	Student states a position and can state the objectives to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/ concepts but does not respond to them (and ultimately objections, assumption, and implications are compartmentalized by student and do not affect student's position).	Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of, different ethical perspectives/concepts, but the student's response is inadequate.	Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of and can reasonably defend against the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concept, and the student's defense is adequate and effective.	



## Appendix B

### 2016-2017 Assessment Calendar

Program	Assessment Team Members	Fall Semester			Spring Semester		
		Artifact	Instructor	Assessment Complete?	Artifact	Instructor	Assessment Complete?
Athletic Training	Anna Greer, Gail Samdperil	--	--	--	Debate Exercise (AT 275)	Eleni D.	X
Exercise Science	Anna Greer, Gail Samdperil	Ethics Assign. (EX 366)	Valerie Wherley	X	--	--	
Masters EX	Anna Greer, Gail Samdperil	--	--	--	Ethics Module	Beau Greer	X
Health Informatics	Steve Burrows, Christina Gunther, Bev Fein	--	--	--	Ethics Case Studies (HINF 502)	TBA	X
Health Science	Steve Burrows, Christina Gunther, Bev Fein	Case Studies (HS 301)	Janet Betts	X	--	--	--
Occupational Therapy	Jody Bortone, Robin Danzak, Eric Nemec	Interprofessional Ethics Assignment (OT 607)	Sharon McCloskey	X	--	--	--
Physical Therapy	Bev Fein, Steve Burrows, Christina Gunther	Interprofessional Ethics Assignment (PT 825)	Kristin Schweizer	X	--	--	--

Speech Language Pathology	Robin Danzak, Jody Bortone, Eric Nemec	Ethics Assignment (SLP 507)	Carolyn Falconer- Horne & Christina Pino	X	--	--	--
---------------------------------	----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	---	----	----	----