

Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College

Discipline	Course Number	Title
Physical Therapist Assistant	200	PTA 200 05/30/2019- Therapeutic Modalities
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Health Sciences	Allied Health	Patricia Hill
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

I. Review previous assessment reports submitted for this course and provide the following information.

1. Was this course previously assessed and if so, when?

No

2. Briefly describe the results of previous assessment report(s).

3.

4. Briefly describe the Action Plan/Intended Changes from the previous report(s), when and how changes were implemented.

5.

II. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Demonstrate competence in safe and appropriate administration of specific thermal and athermal modalities, electrotherapeutic agents, biofeedback and traction identifying rationale, precautions, indications, contraindications, benefits and risks in order to implement a plan of care established by a physical therapist.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Written and lab practical examinations
 - Assessment Date: Winter 2010
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: Random sample of students (50% of each section and/or no less than 4/section)
 - 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)
	2019, 2018, 2017	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
96	45

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 who completed the course in 2017 and 2018, meaning those who took the lab practical and written final exam, were included in the assessment. In 2019, one student who took the lab final did not take the written exam. That student's lab final was included in the assessment. All other students took both the lab practical and written exam.

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.

All sections of this course are face-to-face on campus during the day.

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

Both a written and lab practical exam were used to assess the course. The written final exam consists of multiple choice and short answer questions. The Master Syllabus indicated that the total written final exam score was the assessment tool. In addition, I included two sample items: one addressing indications (#7) and the other (#45) addressing contraindications for specific modalities. The item for identifying indications (#7) was a multiple-choice question. The short answer question (#45), required students to describe contraindications for a category of modality. Both items were scored using the answer key for the exam.

The lab practical exam required students to demonstrate a simulated patient treatment using a modality on either a peer, a licensed Physical Therapist Assistant (usually an alumni) or a licensed Physical Therapist (usually a faculty member). Students selected a patient scenario and collected data, educated the "patient,"

administered the modality and assessed the patient response. Following the treatment, they created documentation in a treatment note. This exam was scored using a skill check rubric that included safety, communication (describing the treatment and the expected results) and safe administration.

The written exam and lab practical were graded by program faculty.

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

Using total written final exam scores in 2017, 92.3% (12/13) scored greater than 80 percent. In 2018, 94% (16/17) scored > 80 percent. In 2019, 100% scored > 80 percent.

The item for identifying indications (#7) was a multiple-choice question. In 2017, 100% (13/13) of the students answered correctly. In 2018, 94% (16/17) answered correctly. In 2019, 92% (13/14) answered correctly.

The short answer question (#45), required students to describe contraindications for a category of modality. Students received full or partial credit for their responses. In 2017, 46.1% (6/13) received full credit for their response. 53% (7/13) received partial credit (1.5 points out of 2). In 2018, 12/17 (70.5%) received full credit, 16/17 (94%) received partial credit (1.5 points out of 2). In 2019, all students, 100% (14/14) received full credit.

For the lab final exam: In 2017, 85 percent of the students (11/13) scored greater than 80%. In 2018, 88.2 percent of the students scored greater than 80% and in 2019, 100% of the students score greater than 80 percent.

While the standard of success was met, students did not do as well in describing contraindications in writing.

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

Students consistently demonstrated their ability to apply a treatment modality to a simulated patient safely and appropriately. They were able to describe and identify contraindications.

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.

In 2017 and 2018, the final lab practical consisted of a single case scenario requiring a single treatment. In 2019, the lab final format changed and students were given two scenarios and demonstrated competence in two modalities. Both models appear to be meeting the needs of students and preparing them for clinical education where they will treat real patients.

Due to time constraints, students are not required to verbalize description of contraindications for modalities. Much of class time is spent developing good verbal explanations of the procedure, benefits and expected reaction. We will put greater emphasis on identifying contraindications in patient scenarios both in written exam and skill checks.

Outcome 2: Identify and demonstrate appropriate data collection, documentation and communication skills related to administration, adjusting and relating therapeutic interventions to short and long-term goals identified in the plan of care.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Written and lab practical examinations
 - Assessment Date: Winter 2010
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: Random sample of students (50% of each section and/or no less than 4/section)
 - 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)
	2019, 2018, 2017	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
96	45

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 who completed the course in 2017 and 2018, meaning those who took the lab practical and written final exam, were included in the assessment. In 2019, one student who took the lab final did not take the written exam. That student's lab final was included in the assessment. All other students took both the lab practical and written exam.

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.

All students in all sections were included. This face-to-face class meets on campus during the day.

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

As part of the lab final exam, students documented the “treatment” using the Subjective-Objective-Assessment-Plan (SOAP) note format. Faculty members graded the note for completeness. Sample items from the written final exam were used to assess students' ability to describe an appropriate reaction to a specific treatment (item #45), explain a component of the treatment (item #47). In items 59-66, patient reactions to a treatment were presented, and students were required to identify the type of reaction (normal, adverse, emergent) and their correct response to the patient reaction. The written exam was graded using an answer key.

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

Scores for the SOAP note component of the lab practical exams are as follows: in 2017, 84.6% (11/13) of the students scored 80% or higher, in 2018, 70% (12/17) of the students scored 80% or higher and in 2019, all (15/15) of the students scored 80% or higher. For those three years, 88% of students met the standard.

Scores for the written exam component are as follows: In 2017, 79.48% of students answered correctly or received $\geq 80\%$ credit for the answers. In 2018, 86.2% of students answered correctly or received $\geq 80\%$ credit for the answers. In 2019, 80.9% of students answered correctly or received $\geq 80\%$ credit for the answers. For those three years, 82% of students met the standard.

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

Students were able to communicate through written documentation and written exams. They demonstrated beginner level documentation skills.

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 met, the following could improve student achievement:

1. In addition to the lab practical, greater emphasis on verbal communication should be included in the course and course assessment.
2. Students could benefit by exposure to electronic documentation in addition to the SOAP note format.
3. Greater emphasis could be placed on how to respond to patient reactions to treatment in classroom and written test scenarios.

Outcome 3: Identify physiologic reactions, pain, adverse reactions and emergency situations and respond appropriately.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Written and lab practical examinations
 - Assessment Date: Winter 2010
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: Random sample of students (50% of each section and/or no less than 4/section)
 - 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)
	2019, 2018, 2017	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed

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 who completed the course in 2017 and 2018, meaning those who took the lab practical and written final exam, were included in the assessment. In 2019, one student who took the lab final did not take the written exam. That student's lab final was included in the assessment. All other students took both the lab practical and written exam.

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.

All sections of this course are face-to-face on campus during the day.

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

The total written final exam score was indicated as the assessment tool in the Master Syllabus.

In addition, a sample of final exam test items were used to assess students' ability to identify an adverse reaction to a modality (#13), an appropriate PTA response to an adverse reaction (#25), an adverse reaction (#27), and pain responses (# 31 and 32). In items 59 -66, patient reactions to a treatment were presented, and students were required to identify the type of reaction (normal, adverse, emergent) and their correct response to the patient reaction. Exams were graded/scored by faculty using an answer key.

The lab practical was not used to assess 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

Written final exam scores: In 2017, 92.3% (12/13) of students scored > 80%. In 2018, 94% (16/17) of students scored > 80%. In 2019, 100% (14/14) of students scored > 80%. Of the 44 students who took the written final exam, 42 scored \geq 80%. The standard of success was met.

Students scored well on the sample items as well (see course assessment data). In 2017, students' scores on the items ranged between 82 and 100%. In 2018, student's scores ranged from 84 to 100%. In 2019, students' scores ranged from 71 to 100% with the lowest scores being in the group of items requiring students to identify the best response to a patient reaction to a modality. In the other items, students' scores ranged from 85 to 100%.

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

The course appears to be meeting student needs in their ability to identify patient reactions. Students demonstrated that they can identify normal and abnormal responses to therapeutic modalities.

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.

In order to increase the level of student achievement, course instructors can place greater emphasis on identifying the correct response to a variety of patient responses to a therapeutic intervention. Also, greater emphasis on how to adapt treatment to meet patient needs could be included.

III. Course Summary and Intended Changes Based on Assessment Results

1. Based on the previous report's Intended Change(s) identified in Section I above, please discuss how effective the changes were in improving student learning.

N/A

2. 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?

This course assessment, along with the report of clinical education sites, indicates that students are doing well with their knowledge of and ability to administer therapeutic modalities. Course instructors need to increase emphasis on the students' ability to verbally communicate rationale, communicate contraindications, generate clear concise documentation and identify adverse reactions.

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

The results of this assessment will be shared with PTA program faculty.

4.

Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Outcome Language	Update the Master syllabus breaking outcome 1 into two outcomes. One will reflect skill competence and clinical decision making, and one will reflect the ability to identify adverse and normal reactions.	Outcome 1 was too broad.	2020
Course Materials (e.g. textbooks, handouts, on-line ancillaries)	Include electronic documentation.	Most clinical sites use electronic documentation, and students can benefit by being exposed to this tool.	2020
Other: Course content and activities	Increase classroom emphasis and practice on identifying contraindications to a modality.	When implementing a plan of care developed by the physical therapist, a PTA student, and later as a PTA, will need to be able to recognize when the modality is contraindicated and to explain this to other members of the health care team.	2020

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

6.

III. Attached Files

[Lab Final Practical Check-off](#)

[Course Data 2018](#)

[Course Data 2017](#)

[Course Data 2019](#)

[PTA 200 Written Final](#)

Faculty/Preparer: Patricia Hill **Date:** 06/25/2019

Department Chair: Kristina Sprague **Date:** 06/26/2019

Dean: Valerie Greaves **Date:** 06/27/2019

Assessment Committee Chair: Shawn Deron **Date:** 08/19/2019