

# 2013-2014 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT TEMPLATE

This template intends to make our annual assessment and its reports simple, clear, and of high quality not only for this academic year but also for the years to come. Thus, it explicitly specifies some of the best assessment practices and/or expectations implied in the four WASC assessment rubrics we have used in the last few years (see the information below\* that has appeared in Appendices 1, 2a, 2b, and 7 in the *Feedback for the 2011-2012 Assessment Report*; Appendix 2 in the *Feedback for the 2012-2013 Assessment Report*, and Appendices 5 to 8 in the *2013-2014 Annual Assessment Guideline*).

We understand some of our programs/departments have not used and/or adopted these best practices this year, and that is okay. You do not need to do anything extra this year, and ALL YOU NEED TO DO is to report what you have done this academic year. However, we hope our programs will use many of these best practices in the annual assessment in the future.

We also hope to use the information from this template to build a digital database that is simple, clear, and of high quality. If you find it necessary to modify or refine the wording or the content of some of the questions to address the specific needs of your program, please make the changes and highlight them in red. We will consider your suggestion(s). Thank you!

If you have any questions or need any help, please send an email to Dr. Amy Liu ([liuqa@csus.edu](mailto:liuqa@csus.edu)), Director of University Assessment. We are looking forward to working with you.

\*The four WASC rubrics refer to: 1) WASC “Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes”; 2) WASC “Rubric for Assessing the Use of Capstone Experience for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes”; 3) WASC “Rubric for Assessing the Use of Portfolio for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes”; and 4) WASC “Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews”.

## Part 1: Background Information

**B1. Program name:** Doctor of Physical Therapy Program

**B2. Report author(s):** Edward Barakatt, PT, PhD, Chair

**B3. Fall 2012 enrollment:** 64

Use the *Department Fact Book 2013* by OIR (Office of Institutional Research) to get the fall 2012 enrollment: (<http://www.csus.edu/oir/Data%20Center/Department%20Fact%20Book/Departmental%20Fact%20Book.html>).

**B4. Program type: [SELECT ONLY ONE]**

	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
	2. Credential
	3. Master’s degree
X	4. Doctorate: Ph.D./E.D.D./D.P.T.
	5. Other, specify:

**Part 2: Six Questions for the 2013-2014 Annual Assessment**

**Question 1 (Q1): Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) Assessed in 2013-2014.**

**Q1.1.** Which of the following program learning outcomes (PLOs) or Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals did you assess in 2013-2014? (See 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report Guidelines for more details). [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

X	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1)*
X	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
X	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
X	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
X	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
X	9. Team work
X	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
X	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
X	13. Ethical reasoning
X	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
X	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
X	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above: a. b. c.

\* One of the WASC’s new requirements is that colleges and universities report on the level of student performance at graduation in five core areas: **critical thinking, information literacy, written communication, oral communication, and quantitative literacy.**

**Q1.1.1.** Please provide more detailed information about the PLO(s) you checked above:

This year the learning outcomes we have measured include:

- i. Graduates’ self-assessment as to whether they have achieved program educational goals and objectives at time of graduation.
- ii. Graduates’ ultimate pass rate of the National Physical Therapy Examination averaged over the last three years.
- iii. National Physical Therapy Examination Content Area Average Scores
- iv. Graduates’ aggregate performance on criteria in the Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI).
- v. Evaluation of graduates’ portfolios

**Q1.2.** Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

X	1. Yes
	2. No

	3. Don't know
--	---------------

**Q1.3.** Is your program externally accredited (except for WASC)?

X	1. Yes
	2. No <b>(If no, go to Q1.4)</b>
	3. Don't know <b>(Go to Q1.4)</b>

**Q1.3.1.** If yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q1.4.** Have you used the *Degree Qualification Profile (DQP)*\* to develop your PLO(s)?

	1. Yes
	2. No, but I know what DQP is.
X	3. No. I don't know what DQP is.
	4. Don't know

\* **Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP)** – a framework funded by the Lumina Foundation that describes the kinds of learning and levels of performance that may be expected of students who have earned an associate, baccalaureate, or master's degree. Please see the links for more details:

[http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The\\_Degree\\_Qualifications\\_Profile.pdf](http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The_Degree_Qualifications_Profile.pdf) and  
<http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/DQPNew.html>.

## **Question 2 (Q2): Standards of Performance/Expectations for EACH PLO.**

**Q2.1.** Has the program developed/adopted **EXPLICIT** standards of performance/expectations for the PLO(s) you assessed in **2013-2014 Academic Year**? (For example: We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 on the Written Communication VALUE rubric.)

X	1. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for <b>ALL PLOs assessed in 2013-14.</b>
	2. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for <b>SOME PLOs assessed in 2013-14.</b>
	3. No <b>(If no, go to Q2.2)</b>
	4. Don't know <b>(Go to Q2.2)</b>
	5. Not Applicable <b>(Go to Q2.2)</b>

**Q2.1.1.** If yes, what are the desired levels of learning, including the criteria and standards of performance/expectations, especially at or near graduation, for **EACH PLO** assessed in 2013-2014 Academic Year? (For example: what will tell you if students have achieved your expected level of performance for the learning outcome.) **Please provide the rubric and/or the expectations that you have developed for EACH PLO one at a time below.** [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

- i. Our most recent graduates were surveyed at graduation whether or not, by self-assessment, they achieved program educational goals and objectives. For graduates' self-assessment as to whether they have achieved program educational goals and objectives, graduates rate each goal and objective on a one to five scale (5=Excellent; 4=Good; 3=Fair; 2=Poor; 1=Very Poor). Each goal and objective that has an aggregate score of less than or equal to a 3.0 rating indicating graduates thought their preparation was only Fair or less than Fair would have been examined by the Curriculum Committee.

- ii. Graduates ultimate pass rates of the National Physical Therapy Examination averaged over the last three years were determined by information purchased from the Federation for Physical Therapy Examinations, the organization that administers the licensure examination. Graduates' pass rate of the National Physical Therapy Licensure Examination averaged over the last three years should be greater than 80%.
- iii. Graduates aggregate National Physical Therapy Examination Content Scores not significantly different than the national averages (at the .10 level of significance).
- iv. The Department's Director of Clinical Education (DCE) compiled the ratings and comments provided by clinical instructors on the CPI, the grading tool utilized by clinical instructors to rate students' performance during clinical internships. The online CPI instrument produces reports on aggregate data for each clinical course. Graduates' performance on criteria in the CPI requires that students attain at least threshold competency levels for 15 of the 18 performance criteria. Threshold expectations increase with each clinical course: For PT400A ratings at or above "Intermediate Performance" is required; for PT400B ratings at or above "Advanced Intermediate" is required; for PT400C ratings of "Entry Level" is required. Achievement of these minimal threshold ratings is required in order to pass the course.
- v. Students add materials representative of their growth and professional physical therapists over the 2.5 year duration of the physical therapy program. Graduates' portfolios were evaluated by the Department Council. Evaluation of at least 30% of graduates' randomly chosen portfolios is performed. A grading rubric addressing a specified area of the portfolio is used to assess a program objective. Last year graduates' neurologic physical therapy evaluations generated from activities in their neurologic physical therapy courses were assessed. This year graduates' orthopedic evaluations' of patients generated from an orthopedic course or during a clinical internship were evaluated. Presence or absence of the components of an orthopedic evaluation were assessed and aggregate findings computed. Any findings of consistent absence of components of an orthopedic evaluation are reported to the Curriculum Committee and instructors of the courses in which orthopedic evaluations are taught.

**Q2.2. Have you published the PLO(s)/expectations/rubric(s) you assessed in 2013-2014?**

X	1. Yes
	2. No <b>(If no, go to Q3.1)</b>

**Q2.2.1. If yes, where were the PLOs/expectations/rubrics published? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]**

	1. In <b>SOME course syllabi/assignments</b> in the program that claim to introduce/develop/master the PLO(s)
	2. In <b>ALL course syllabi/assignments</b> in the program that claim to introduce /develop/master the PLO(s)
	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
	4. In the university catalogue
	5. On the academic unit website or in the newsletters
X	6. In the assessment or program review reports/plans/resources/activities

	7. In the new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
	10. In other places, specify:

**Question 3 (Q3): Data, Results, and Conclusions for EACH PLO**

**Q3.1.** Was assessment data/evidence collected for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

**Q3.2.** If yes, was the data scored/evaluated for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

**Q3.3.** If yes, what DATA have you collected? What are the results, findings, and CONCLUSION(s) for EACH PLO assessed in 2013-2014? In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations? In what areas do students need improvement? Please provide a simple and clear summary of the key data and findings, including tables and graphs if applicable for EACH PLO one at a time. [WORD LIMIT: 600 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

- i & iii. Graduate Surveys and National Physical Therapy Examination Content Area Report
- In last year's survey of graduates' self-assessment as to whether they have achieved program educational goals and objectives, the lowest areas of ratings, while still above the 3.0 threshold, was found to be in the areas of diagnosing and determining areas of needs in patients with musculoskeletal problems and determining a plan of care for individuals with genitourinary and psychological problems. We did not find until after the assessment was completed that the National Physical Therapy Examination Content Area in "Musculoskeletal System" was also significantly below the national average. The teaching approach in the orthopedics courses emphasizing patient problem solving was addressed by informing the instructors of the orthopedics course of this finding. Additionally, a new instructor with advanced training and experience teaching orthopedic physical therapy from a problem solving perspective was assigned to co-teach the musculoskeletal course. Per chance, the new instructor co-taught the first orthopedics course and taught the second semester orthopedics course independently due to a sabbatical assignment. Overall, all graduate survey items scored well above the 3.0 criteria. The survey item that addressed determining needs in patients with musculoskeletal patients improved considerably from 3.7/5 up to 4.4/5. The National Physical Therapy Examination Content Area in "Musculoskeletal System" average score improved from 54% below the national average to 2% above the national average. Continued attention to this area will be focused as we integrate the previous instructor back into the course.
  - The development of treatment plans for genitourinary and gastrointestinal problems is a specialty area in physical therapy. Students will continue to be exposed to this specialty care area through

guest speakers and given guidance on how to improve their skills following graduation through post-graduate specialty courses. While this was found to again have lower ratings by graduates on the graduate survey, the ratings are still above the 3.0 threshold (4.0/5 & 3.9/5, respectively). The graduate survey scores for determining a plan of care for individuals with psychological problems was 4.0/5. Graduates' National Physical Therapy Examination Content Area averages in the area that contains these three topics was just above the national average. The Curriculum Committee will discuss this issue to determine if any additional emphasis should be placed on these three topics and bring it to Program Council for a general discussion.

- ii. The ultimate National Physical Therapy Examination pass rate by the graduates averaged over the last three years is 97%, well above the required threshold of 80%.
- iv. Graduates' aggregate score on the Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) for their final clinical internship overall was at Entry Level, the minimal level of performance to pass the class. This level of performance was achieved on 17 of 18 of the CPI's individual criteria. Our threshold for review is achieving this level of performance on less than 15 of the 18 criteria. Thus, our threshold for this area of assessment was met.
- v. Based on last year's portfolio review (class of 2011), the Curriculum Committee took up the issue of improving "Participation Limitations" in the examination, plan of care and interventions for patients with neurologic conditions in consultation with the instructors of the courses in which neurologic physical therapy is taught. Results of this intervention will be assessed next year which is when we will again assess students' in the examination, plan of care and interventions for patients with neurologic conditions.

The most recent portfolio assessment (class of 2012) was of students' examination, plan of care and interventions for patients with orthopedic conditions. A pattern of missing information in the areas of functional and participation examination, plan of care and interventions information were noted in the students orthopedic evaluations. The cohort evaluated was the cohort that rated their musculoskeletal preparation in the lower range and score significantly below the national average on the National Physical Therapy Examination Content Area of Musculoskeletal System. This information will be referred to the Curriculum Committee for further consideration.

**Q3.4.** Do students meet the expectations/standards of performance as determined by the program and achieved the learning outcomes? [PLEASE MAKE SURE THE PLO YOU SPECIFY HERE IS THE SAME ONE YOU CHECKED/SPECIFIED IN Q1.1].

**Q3.4.1.** First PLO: [ \_\_\_\_\_ Critical Thinking \_\_\_\_\_ ]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

**[NOTE: IF YOU HAVE MORE THAN ONE PLO, YOU NEED TO REPEAT THE TABLE IN Q3.4.1 UNTIL YOU INCLUDE ALL THE PLO(S) YOU ASSESSED IN 2013-2014.]**

**Q3.4.2.** Second PLO: [ \_\_\_\_\_ Information literacy \_\_\_\_\_ ]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

**Q3.4.2.** Second PLO: [ \_\_\_\_\_ Written communication \_\_\_\_\_ ]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Q3.4.2. Second PLO: [ \_\_\_\_\_ Oral communication \_\_\_\_\_ ]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Q3.4.2. Second PLO: [ \_\_\_\_\_ Inquiry and analysis \_\_\_\_\_ ]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Q3.4.2. Second PLO: [ \_\_\_\_\_ Team work \_\_\_\_\_ ]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Q3.4.2. Second PLO: [ \_\_\_\_\_ Problem solving \_\_\_\_\_ ]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Q3.4.2. Second PLO: [ \_\_\_\_\_ Intercultural knowledge and competency \_\_\_\_\_ ]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Q3.4.2. Second PLO: [ \_\_\_\_\_ Ethical reasoning \_\_\_\_\_ ]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Q3.4.2. Second PLO: [ \_\_\_\_\_ Foundations and skills for lifelong learning \_\_\_\_\_ ]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Q3.4.2. Second PLO: [ \_\_\_\_\_ Integrative and applied learning \_\_\_\_\_ ]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

**Q3.4.2.** Second PLO: [ \_\_\_\_\_ Overall competencies in the major/discipline \_\_\_\_\_ ]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

**Question 4 (Q4): Evaluation of Data Quality: Reliability and Validity.**

**Q4.1.** How many PLOs **in total** did your program assess in the 2013-2014 academic year? [ \_\_\_\_\_ ]

**Q4.2.** Please choose **ONE ASSESSED PLO** as an example to illustrate how you use direct, indirect, and/or other methods/measures to collect data. If you only assessed one PLO in 2013-14, YOU CAN SKIP this question. If you assessed MORE THAN ONE PLO, please check **ONLY ONE PLO BELOW EVEN IF YOU ASSESSED MORE THAN ONE PLO IN 2013-2014.**

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) <sup>1</sup>
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
X	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Other PLO. Specify:

**Direct Measures**

**Q4.3.** Were direct measures used to assess this PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No <b>(If no, go to Q4.4)</b>
	3. Don't know <b>(Go to Q4.4)</b>

**Q4.3.1.** Which of the following **DIRECT** measures were used? [Check all that apply]

	1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
	2. Key assignments from other <b>CORE</b> classes
	3. Key assignments from other classes
X	4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques
	5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects
	6. E-Portfolios
X	7. Other portfolios
	8. Other measure. Specify:

**Q4.3.2.** Please provide the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] that you used to collect the data. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

Orthopedic evaluation and neurologic physical therapy evaluation included in the students' portfolios.

**Q4.3.2.1.** Was the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the rubric/criterion?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.3.** Was the direct measure (s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.4.** How was the evidence scored/evaluated? [Select one only]

	1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (If checked, go to Q4.3.7)
	2. Use rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class
	3. Use rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
X	4. Use rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
	5. Use other means. Specify:

**Q4.3.5.** What rubric/criterion was adopted to score/evaluate the above key assignments/projects/portfolio? [Select one only]

	1. The VALUE rubric(s)
	2. Modified VALUE rubric(s)
X	3. A rubric that is totally developed by local faculty
	4. Use other means. Specify:

**Q4.3.6.** Was the rubric/criterion aligned directly with the PLO?

	1. Yes
--	--------

	2. No
X	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.7.** Were the evaluators (e.g., faculty or advising board members) who reviewed student work calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.8.** Were there checks for inter-rater reliability?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.9.** Were the sample sizes for the direct measure adequate?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.3.10.** How did you select the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc)? Please briefly specify here:

All student portfolios were evaluated; last year from the PT224 course, this year from the PT225 course.

**Indirect Measures**

**Q4.4.** Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q4.5)

**Q4.4.1.** Which of the following indirect measures were used?

	1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE, etc.)
	2. University conducted student surveys (OIR surveys)
	3. College/Department/program conducted student surveys
X	4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
X	7. Others, specify: Licensing Examination Data

**Q4.4.2.** If surveys were used, were the sample sizes adequate?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.4.3.** If surveys were used, please briefly specify how you select your sample? What is the response rate?

We survey all of our graduates and all of our alumni 6 months after they take their licensing examination.

**Other Measures**

**Q4.5.** Were external benchmarking data used to assess the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No ( <b>If no, go to Q4.6</b> )

**Q4.5.1.** Which of the following measures was used?

X	1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
	2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc)
	3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc)
	4. Others, specify:

**Q4.6.** Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No ( <b>Go to Q4.7</b> )
	3. Don't know ( <b>Go to Q4.7</b> )

**Q4.6.1.** If yes, please specify: [\_\_Students' clinical internships Clinical Performance Instrument\_\_]

**Alignment and Quality**

**Q4.7.** Please describe how you collected the data? For example, in what course(s) (or by what means) were data collected? How reliable and valid is the data? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

Products for portfolio collected from multiple courses. Community Advisory Committee Critiques portfolio. All graduates surveyed using online survey tool. Results/information of National Physical Therapy Examination purchased from the Federation of Physical Therapy Boards. Clinical Performance Instruments completed online by clinical instructors for all clinical internships. Aggregate information is provided by the online software managed by the Director of Clinical Education.

**Q4.8.** How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO? [\_\_5\_\_]

**NOTE: IF IT IS ONLY ONE, GO TO Q5.1.**

**Q4.8.1.** Did the data (including all the assignments/projects/portfolios) from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q4.8.2.** Were **ALL** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Question 5 (Q5): Use of Assessment Data.**

**Q5.1.** To what extent have the assessment results from 2012-2013 been used for? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

	Very Much (1)	Quite a Bit (2)	Some (3)	Not at all (4)	Not Applicable (9)
1. Improving specific courses	X				
2. Modifying curriculum	X				
3. Improving advising and mentoring	X				
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals					
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations					
6. Developing/updating assessment plan	X				
7. Annual assessment reports	X				
8. Program review	X				
9. Prospective student and family information	X				
10. Alumni communication					
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)					
12. Program accreditation	X				
13. External accountability reporting requirement	X				
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					
15. Strategic planning	X				
16. Institutional benchmarking					
17. Academic policy development or modification					
18. Institutional Improvement					
19. Resource allocation and budgeting					
20. New faculty hiring					
21. Professional development for faculty and staff	X				
22. Other Specify:					

**Q5.1.1.** Please provide one or two best examples to show how you have used the assessment data above.

**Q5.2.** As a result of the **assessment effort in 2013-2014** and based on the prior feedbacks from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of program learning outcomes)?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q5.3)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q5.3)

**Q5.2.1.** What changes are anticipated? By what mechanism will the changes be implemented? How and when will you assess the impact of proposed modifications? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

Making sure that the gains in the Musculoskeletal Examination & Evaluation areas are maintained. Teaching assignments may be altered to achieve this goal.

**Q5.2.2.** Is there a follow-up assessment on these areas that need improvement?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**Q5.3.** Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to program learning outcomes (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected assessment data in this way, please briefly report your results here. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

**Question 6 (Q6).** Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year?

X	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) <sup>1</sup>
X	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
X	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
X	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
X	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
X	9. Team work
X	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
X	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
X	13. Ethical reasoning
X	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
X	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
X	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that the program is going to <b>assess but not included above:</b> a. b. c.

### Part 3: Additional Information

**A1.** In which academic year did you **develop** the current assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
X	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet <b>developed</b> a formal assessment plan

**A2.** In which academic year did you last **update** your assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
X	9. Have not yet <b>updated</b> the assessment plan

**A3.** Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**A4.** Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment **of student learning** occurs in the curriculum?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**A5.** Does the program have any capstone class?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

**A5.1.** If yes, please list the course number for each capstone class: PT690

**A6.** Does the program have **ANY** capstone project?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A7. Name of the academic unit: Doctor of Physical Therapy Program

A8. Department in which the academic unit is located: Department of Physical Therapy

A9. Department Chair's Name: Edward Barakatt

A10. Total number of annual assessment reports submitted by your academic unit for 2013-2014: 1

A11. College in which the academic unit is located:

	1. Arts and Letters
	2. Business Administration
	3. Education
	4. Engineering and Computer Science
X	5. Health and Human Services
	6. Natural Science and Mathematics
	7. Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
	8. Continuing Education (CCE)
	9. Other, specify:

**Undergraduate Degree Program(s):**

A12. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: [\_\_ \_\_]

A12.1. List all the name(s): [\_\_\_\_\_]

A12.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? [\_\_ \_\_]

**Master Degree Program(s):**

A13. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: [\_\_ \_\_]

A13.1. List all the name(s): [\_\_\_\_\_]

A13.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? [\_\_\_\_\_]

**Credential Program(s):**

A14. Number of credential degree programs the academic unit has: [\_\_\_\_\_]

A14.1. List all the names: [\_\_\_\_\_]

**Doctorate Program(s)**

A15. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: 1

A15.1. List the name(s): Doctor of Physical Therapy

A16. Would this assessment report apply to other program(s) and/or diploma concentration(s) in your academic unit\*?

	1. Yes
X	2. No

\*If the assessment conducted for this program (including the PLO(s), the criteria and standards of performance/expectations you established, the data you collected and analyzed, the conclusions of the assessment) is the same as the assessment conducted for other programs within the academic unit, you only need to submit one assessment report.

16.1. If yes, please specify the name of each program: \_\_\_\_\_

16.2. If yes, please specify the name of each diploma concentration: \_\_\_\_\_