Central Washington University  
Assessment of Student Learning  
Program Report

Please enter the appropriate information concerning your student learning assessment activities for this year.

**Academic Year of Report:** 2012-2013  
**College:** CEPS  
**Department:** Nutrition, Exercise and Health Sciences  
**Program:** B.S. Clinical Physiology (Undergraduate)

1. **What student learning outcomes were assessed this year, and why?**
   The outcome – noted as 1 on the Student Learning Assessment Plan, was assessed during the 2012-2013 year. The outcome description appears below. Student Learning Outcome 1 “Students will demonstrate knowledge of structural components and the interrelationships between these structural components in the human organism”.

   This outcome is related to the program/departmental Goal 1 “Students will demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be successful in the variety of fields encompassed within Clinical Physiology”. This goal is related to College Goal 1 “Provide for outstanding academic and professional growth experiences for students at all CWU locations” and University Goal 1 to “Maintain and strengthen an outstanding academic and student life on the Ellensburg campus”.

   The measured outcome encompasses critical foundational material germane to clinical career arenas intended by clinical physiology graduates.

2. **How were they assessed?**
   In answering these questions, please concisely describe the specific methods used in assessing student learning. Please also specify the population assessed, when the assessment took place, and the standard of mastery (criterion) against which you will compare your assessment results. If appropriate, please list survey or questionnaire response rate from total population.

   **A) What methods were used?**
   **B) Who was assessed?**
   **C) When was it assessed?**

   The outcome “Students will demonstrate knowledge of structural components and the interrelationships between these structural components in the human organism” was evaluated using data from all lecture and laboratory courses in Gross Anatomy (350 and 350L) (n=160), Physiology (351 and 351L) (n=150), and Sports Medicine – Injury Assessment (348) (n=90) undertaken throughout the year. All program students in these courses were assessed and for all assessments, satisfactory material mastery was categorized as a “C or better grade”. Gross Anatomy assessment consisted of cognitive understanding by testing through multiple examinations on material related to anatomic structures including formation and development rates, specific terminology, and structural relationships among various components. Additionally, specific laboratory component assessment involved visual identification of critical anatomical components on prosected cadaver specimens and skeletons. Physiology assessment consisted of cognitive understanding about the relationships between structural
and functional components and how these interact to facilitate optimal regulation of physiologic processes essential for organism homeostasis. Physiology laboratory required interactional-experiential learning, deductive reasoning, and report writing through a variety of hardware and software tools to assess human function. Sport Medicine – Injury evaluated knowledge of injury mechanisms to human structural components through examinations along with experiential learning through both simulations and injury treatment room exposure.

3. What was learned?
In answering this question, please report results in specific qualitative or quantitative terms, with the results linked to the outcomes you assessed, and compared to the standard of mastery (criterion) you noted above. Please also include a concise interpretation or analysis of the results.

1. Student Learning Outcome 1 (Student Learning Assessment Plan). “Students will demonstrate knowledge of structural components and the interrelationships between these structural components in the human organism”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Component</th>
<th>Met Expectations</th>
<th>Below Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Anatomy Laboratory</td>
<td>131/160 (82%)</td>
<td>29/160 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Anatomy Lecture-Exams</td>
<td>144/160 (90%)</td>
<td>16/160 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiology Laboratory</td>
<td>138/150 (92%)</td>
<td>12/150 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiology Lecture-Exams</td>
<td>136/150 (85%)</td>
<td>14/150 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Medicine Injury Assess.</td>
<td>86/90 (96%)</td>
<td>4/90 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>635/710 (89.4%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>75/710 (10.6%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A large percent of students attempting these courses met expectations for this outcome. The marginally lower success rate of the Gross Anatomy Laboratory is likely a function of this being the students’ first exposure to cadaver study coupled with the high degree of discipline- specific terminology required.

4. What will the department or program do as a result of that information?
In answering this question, please note specific changes to your program as they affect student learning, and as they are related to results from the assessment process. If no changes are planned, please describe why no changes are needed. In addition, how will the department report the results and changes to internal and external constituents (e.g., advisory groups, newsletters, forums, etc.)

The Program finds the rate of student success acceptable and believes that the rigorous pre-admission requirements that lead to a selective admission of students are responsible for the high rate of success.

5. What did the department or program do in response to last year’s assessment information?
In answering this question, please describe any changes that have been made to improve student learning based on previous assessment results. Please also discuss any changes you have made to your assessment plan or assessment methods.

The program maintained its pre-admission standards and, as a result of this selective entry process, ensured that the quality of student participating in the program remained extremely high.

6. Questions or suggestions concerning Assessment of Student Learning at Central Washington University: