LEARNING ASSESSMENT CORE OUTCOMES
2010 FOCUS: CRITICAL THINKING AND PROBLEM SOLVING

SAC NAME: Health Information Management
Contact: Ann Wenning, 503-978-5075, awenning@pcc.edu

PLAN 2010:
The HIM program SAC will evaluate student proficiency using a modified version of WSU’s critical and integrative thinking rubric, with the goal being:

- to identify expected student learning outcomes for critical thinking that are course appropriate
- to include at least one critical thinking project or assessment tool in each HIM program course
- to evaluate student progress by using beginning and end of term surveys
- to analyze and interpret results of student critical thinking abilities using the adopted rubric
- to use the assessment results to modify and improve course assignments in the future

Critical Thinking and Problem Solving Rubric
For each stated objective or performance, rate the proficiency according to guidelines described in each column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE #:</th>
<th>Beginning (1)</th>
<th>Developing(2)</th>
<th>Accomplished(3)</th>
<th>Exemplary (4)</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stated objective or performance</td>
<td>Identifiable performance characteristics reflecting a beginning level of performance</td>
<td>Identifiable performance characteristics reflecting development and movement toward mastery of performance</td>
<td>Identifiable performance characteristic reflecting mastery of performance</td>
<td>Identifiable performance characteristics reflecting the highest level of performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in discussion topic (if applicable)</td>
<td>Does not attempt or fails to exhibit full understanding of topic discussion</td>
<td>Discussion comments primarily rely on other student observations</td>
<td>Addresses discussion topic with a clear sense of scope and context</td>
<td>Discussion comments reflect thoughtful analysis and interpretation of topic discussion. Student lists relevant examples validating their opinion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### June 2010 Response Summary

Course evaluated: HIM 131- Medical Science, Spring term 2010  
Evaluation tool used: End of term survey (14 responses)

Medical Science is a 5 credit pathophysiology course requiring students to use critical thinking skills to correctly diagnose disease processes. Students were asked to assess how much knowledge of disease pathology they had at the beginning of the term compared to their knowledge at the end of the term.

**The student responses to the survey questions are as follows:**

**How would you rate how much knowledge of diseases and their pathology you knew at the BEGINNING of the term?**
- 14.3% - no knowledge of diseases and their pathology
- 28.6% - very little knowledge of diseases and their pathology
- 35.7% - had some knowledge of diseases and their pathology
- 21.4% - had more than average knowledge of diseases and their pathology
- 0% - had quite a bit of knowledge of diseases and their pathology

**How would you rate how much knowledge of diseases and their pathology you knew at the END of the term?**
- 0% - no knowledge of diseases and their pathology
- 0% - very little knowledge of diseases and their pathology
- 0% - had some knowledge of diseases and their pathology
- 50% - had more than average knowledge of diseases and their pathology
- 50% - had quite a bit of knowledge of diseases and their pathology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shows evidence of attention to detail</th>
<th>Presents, assesses, and analyzes appropriate supporting data/evidence</th>
<th>Evaluation/Analysis of the data and questions its accuracy, relevance, and completeness. Justifies data results and explains assumptions and reasons.</th>
<th>Demonstrates attention to detail and indicates adequate exploration of topic/material</th>
<th>Offers compelling evidence that topic/material was explored with attention to detail</th>
<th>Evidence or sources are simplistic, inappropriate, or not related to topic</th>
<th>Demonstrates adequate skill in searching, selecting, and evaluating sources</th>
<th>Evidence or sources are simplistic, inappropriate, or not related to topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimal or no evidence that topic/material was analyzed</td>
<td>Minimal or no evidence of search or selection of supporting data/evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of topic/material is presented but no indication of further exploration</td>
<td>Analysis of topic/material is presented but no indication of further exploration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Survey results Summary:**
Student survey results indicate the students vastly improved their understanding of diseases and disease pathology by the end of the term. The survey alone gives positive feedback, but needs to be substantiated using documented project results (See Plan below).

**Plan:** Health Information Management instructors will continue surveys of their classes in fall, 2010. In addition, each instructor will analyze a critical thinking project used in one of their courses and interpret results using the adopted rubric.