

# Program-level Student Learning Outcomes Results Report Template

Academic Degree Programs

University of Kentucky

## INSTRUCTIONS

---

The faculty of each academic program, degree or certificate, are asked to complete this report template during the 2021-22 academic year to provide the results obtained during the second year of the new program-level student learning outcomes (PSLOs) assessment cycle. These results reports are due to the Office of Strategic Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (OSPIE) by **July 1, 2022**, unless an *earlier* deadline has been set by the college dean, and should be submitted to the appropriate program folder in [SharePoint](#).

Instructional guides, videos, and other materials are available in the SharePoint site to help guide you. You can also reach out to the [OSPIE staff](#) with questions or to schedule a consultation.

## ABOUT THE PROGRAM

---

College or School *(example: College of Arts & Sciences)*

College of Education

Department *(if applicable)*

Kinesiology and Health Promotion

Degree Type *(example: BA, MS, Graduate Certificate)*

BS

Program Name *(example: History)*

Kinesiology (Exercise Science, non-teacher education track)

## CONTACT INFORMATION

---

Individual(s) who completed this report

First and Last Name	Title/Position	Email
Rosie Lanphere	Program Chair	rosie.lanphere@uky.edu

# Program-level Student Learning Outcomes Results Report Template

Academic Degree Programs

University of Kentucky

## PROGRAM-LEVEL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

Please list all program-level student learning outcomes (PSLOs) for the program in the table below. These can be copied and pasted directly from the program's [2019-20 PSLO assessment plan](#) if one was submitted. Any outcomes that were revised after the 2019-20 PSLO plan was submitted should be indicated by clicking the checkbox in the row for that outcome. Additionally, any parts that were revised should be bolded or highlighted. Note: all PSLOs for the program should be included in the table below, not just those that were assessed in 2021-22. For most programs, approximately half of the PSLOs should have been assessed in 2020-21 and the other half should have been assessed in 2021-22 but will depend upon the program's 2019-20 PSLO plan.

Space for up to 12 PSLOs has been provided below, but this does not imply that the program is expected to have 12 outcomes. The program may delete any unnecessary outcome lines or insert additional rows if needed.

PSLO #	Program-level Student Learning Outcome Statement <a href="#">(How should these be written?)</a>	Assessed in 2021-22?	Revised Since <a href="#">2019-20 PSLO Plan?</a>
<i>Example</i>	<i>Graduates will be able to critically evaluate scientific literature related to drugs and disease to enhance clinical decision-making.</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1	<i>Describe current physical activity guidelines for health benefits and the relationship between physical activity and health/fitness outcomes.</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	<i>Demonstrate knowledge mastery in exercise physiology, sport psychology, strength and conditioning for sports, and biomechanics as it applies to human performance.</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3	<i>Develop and implement appropriate exercise prescriptions to meet the health and performance goals of diverse populations.</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	<i>Demonstrate knowledge and instruction in exercise technique, physical fitness, and health assessments.</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

# Program-level Student Learning Outcomes Results Report Template

Academic Degree Programs

University of Kentucky

PSLO #	Program-level Student Learning Outcome Statement <small>(How should these be written?)</small>	Assessed in 2021-22?	Revised Since 2019-20 PSLO Plan?
5	<i>Demonstrate analytical and critical thinking skills related to exercise science.</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	<i>Demonstrate effective communication skills in writing and oral presentation as applied to various exercise science sub-disciplines.</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

# Program-level Student Learning Outcomes Results Report Template

Academic Degree Programs

University of Kentucky

## ASSESSMENT MEASURES

---

Complete the table below by listing each measure used for the PSLOs that were assessed during 21-22. If the program filed a PSLO plan with OSPIE in 19-20, most of the information needed for this table can be copied and pasted from the plan. Please check the [PSLO SharePoint](#) site to determine whether the program has a plan on file and refer to it as needed. Note: only the PSLOs assessed in 21-22 and the measures used to assess those outcomes need to be listed in the table. **If no PSLO plan is on file for 19-20, program-level student learning outcomes will need to be developed or updated, as needed, from an earlier assessment plan or program proposal and measures to assess those outcomes created and listed below.**

### *Instructions*

1. Enter each measure on a separate row. Each measure only needs to be listed once, even if it is used to assess multiple PSLOs.
2. In column 2, provide a name for the measure.
3. In column 3, enter the corresponding number(s) for the PSLO(s) listed in the table above on p.2-3 that the measure was used to assess.
4. If the program submitted a PSLO plan in 19-20 ([verify here](#)):
  - a. If the faculty/staff do not wish to make any changes to the measure's description, rationale, or benchmark, click the checkbox in column 4 indicating no changes made. Move on to the next measure; no additional information is needed for this measure.
  - b. If the faculty/staff wish to change one or more of the following: description, rationale, and/or benchmark for the measure, do not select the checkbox in column 4. Next, enter new information ONLY for the aspects of the measure being revised in columns 5-7. For example, if only the description is being updated, there is no need to enter a rationale or benchmark.

# Program-level Student Learning Outcomes Results Report Template

Academic Degree Programs

University of Kentucky

5. If the program did not submit a plan in 19-20, do not select the checkbox in column 4. Enter all requested information for the measure: description, rationale, and benchmark

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Measure #	Assessment Instrument/ Measure Name	PSLO(s) Mapped to Measure	Measure Description, Rationale, & Benchmark Same as <a href="#">19-20 Plan?</a>	New Assessment Instrument/Measure Description <a href="#">(What is this?)</a> <small>(complete only if description changed from 19-20 or if 19-20 plan not submitted)</small>	New Assessment Instrument/Measure Rationale <a href="#">(What is this?)</a> <small>(complete only if rationale changed from 19-20 or if 19-20 plan not submitted)</small>	New Benchmark or Goal (If Available) <a href="#">(What is this?)</a> <small>(complete only if benchmark changed from 19-20 or if 19-20 plan not submitted)</small>
1	<i>Example: SPIE 430 Final Paper</i>	1,4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Students complete the final paper individually on a relevant &amp; timely topic related to program assessment. Papers are scored by the course instructor using a standard rubric developed by members of the department curriculum committee. No sampling will be done; however, non-SPIE majors will be excluded from the results. The scores for criterion 1 will be used for PSLO1 and criterion 3 for PSLO4 (see attached rubric).</i>	<i>Measure was chosen because it provides evidence of student achievement near end of program and multiple criteria on rubric align directly to outcomes 1 &amp; 4. Curriculum committee recently (2018) reviewed assignment instructions, rubric, and samples of student work to ensure good alignment with outcomes. In the future, multiple evaluators will be used to score a sample of student work and estimate reliability (interrater agreement) of the rubric.</i>	<i>95% of students will earn a 3 or better on each of the 2 mapped criteria (on a 4-point scale)</i>
1-DA	PSLO Quiz – Direct Assessment	1,2,3,5 (#4 was assessed via MC questions during COVID.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>A direct assessment composed of 60 multiple-choice questions was administered in KHP 157 (pretest) vs. KHP 577 (posttest) and compared.</i>	Measure was chosen because it will demonstrate learning occurring throughout the program.	Senior cohort should statistically out-perform first-year cohort; In addition, the percent of the cohorts that scored ≥80% will be reported.

# Program-level Student Learning Outcomes Results Report Template

Academic Degree Programs

University of Kentucky

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Measure #	Assessment Instrument/ Measure Name	PSLO(s) Mapped to Measure	Measure Description, Rationale, & Benchmark Same as <a href="#">19-20 Plan?</a>	New Assessment Instrument/Measure Description <a href="#">(What is this?)</a> <small>(complete only if description changed from 19-20 or if 19-20 plan not submitted)</small>	New Assessment Instrument/Measure Rationale <a href="#">(What is this?)</a> <small>(complete only if rationale changed from 19-20 or if 19-20 plan not submitted)</small>	New Benchmark or Goal (If Available) <a href="#">(What is this?)</a> <small>(complete only if benchmark changed from 19-20 or if 19-20 plan not submitted)</small>
1-IA	PSLO Quiz – Indirect Assessment	3,4,5,6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
2	Program Design Project (KHP 350)	3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
3	Exercise Technique – Practical Evaluation (KHP 350 Lab)	4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Data Analysis: Direct, skill-based proficiency assessments will be administered in KHP 350 and compared to an identified threshold (e.g. ≥80% of max points). Projects were scored by the course instructor using a standard rubric developed by members of the department curriculum committee. See attached rubric.</i>	Assessment was selected because it demonstrates level of student achievement in competency of resistance training exercise technique.	Percent of students achieving ≥80%.

# Program-level Student Learning Outcomes Results Report Template

Academic Degree Programs

University of Kentucky

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Measure #	Assessment Instrument/ Measure Name	PSLO(s) Mapped to Measure	Measure Description, Rationale, & Benchmark Same as <a href="#">19-20 Plan?</a>	New Assessment Instrument/Measure Description <a href="#">(What is this?)</a> (complete only if description changed from 19-20 or if 19-20 plan not submitted)	New Assessment Instrument/Measure Rationale <a href="#">(What is this?)</a> (complete only if rationale changed from 19-20 or if 19-20 plan not submitted)	New Benchmark or Goal (If Available) <a href="#">(What is this?)</a> (complete only if benchmark changed from 19-20 or if 19-20 plan not submitted)
4	Practical Evaluation – Lab skills (KHP 450 Lab)	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Data Analysis: Direct, skill-based mastery assessments will be administered in KHP 450 and will be compared to an identified threshold (e.g., ≥80% of max points). -New MC questions added to PSLO Quiz to address skill related observable traits (i.e., questions 4.A.1, -2, -3).</i>	Assessment was selected because it demonstrates level of student achievement in observable traits of performing basic fitness lab assessment skills (i.e., heart rate and blood pressure).	Upperclassmen should score higher than underclassmen.
5	Written Communication	6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Students' written communication skills will be assessed based on a writing assignment provided in KHP 300 (GCCR class). Papers were scored by the course instructor using a standard rubric developed by members of the department curriculum committee. See attached rubric.	Assessment was selected because it demonstrates level of written communication skills acquired from the Exercise Science Program.	Percent of students achieving an average of ≥80% on writing assignments. The average percentage of students rating "not confident, somewhat confident, confident, &

# Program-level Student Learning Outcomes Results Report Template

Academic Degree Programs

University of Kentucky

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Measure #	Assessment Instrument/ Measure Name	PSLO(s) Mapped to Measure	Measure Description, Rationale, & Benchmark Same as <a href="#">19-20 Plan?</a>	New Assessment Instrument/Measure Description <a href="#">(What is this?)</a> (complete only if description changed from 19-20 or if 19-20 plan not submitted)	New Assessment Instrument/Measure Rationale <a href="#">(What is this?)</a> (complete only if rationale changed from 19-20 or if 19-20 plan not submitted)	New Benchmark or Goal (If Available) <a href="#">(What is this?)</a> (complete only if benchmark changed from 19-20 or if 19-20 plan not submitted)
				<i>-New MC question added to PSLO Quiz to determine confidence in written communication skills (i.e., questions PSLO 6. 1A.2)</i>		very confident" in these skills will be report. Senior cohort will have higher levels of confidence than freshman cohort. Benchmark TBD.
6	Oral Communication	6	☒	Students' oral communication skills will be assessed based on a presentation made in KHP 577. Presentations <i>were scored by the course instructor using a standard rubric developed by members of the department curriculum committee. See attached rubric.</i>	Assessment was selected because it demonstrates level of oral communication skills acquired from the Exercise Science Program.	Percent of students achieving an average of ≥80% on writing assignments.  The average percentage of students rating "not confident, somewhat confident, confident, &



# Program-level Student Learning Outcomes Results Report Template

Academic Degree Programs

University of Kentucky

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<b>Measure #</b>	<b>Assessment Instrument/ Measure Name</b>	<b>PSLO(s) Mapped to Measure</b>	<b>Measure Description, Rationale, &amp; Benchmark Same as <a href="#">19-20 Plan?</a></b>	<b>New Assessment Instrument/Measure Description <a href="#">(What is this?)</a></b> (complete only if description changed from 19-20 or if 19-20 plan not submitted)	<b>New Assessment Instrument/Measure Rationale <a href="#">(What is this?)</a></b> (complete only if rationale changed from 19-20 or if 19-20 plan not submitted)	<b>New Benchmark or Goal (If Available)</b> <a href="#">(What is this?)</a> (complete only if benchmark changed from 19-20 or if 19-20 plan not submitted)
				<i>-New MC questions added to PSLO Quiz to determine confidence in oral communication skills (i.e. questions PSLO 6.IA.1)</i>		very confident" in these skills will be report. Senior cohort will have higher levels of confidence than freshman cohort. Benchmark TBD.

## ASSESSMENT RESULTS

---

# Program-level Student Learning Outcomes Results Report Template

Academic Degree Programs

University of Kentucky

Please complete the chart below by providing the requested information for each measure. The order of the measures should be the same as the Measures Table in the previous section so that numbering is consistent. Note: space for up to 12 measures has been provided. If space for additional measures is needed, either insert additional rows into the table or contact the [OSPIE staff](#) to receive a customized template. The program may delete any extra rows that are not needed.

Measure #	Semester/ Year(s) Data Collected	Total Students Assessed	Sampling Strategy or All Students Assessed <a href="#">(What is this?)</a>	Scoring Process <a href="#">(What is this?)</a>	Summary of Results <a href="#">(What should be included here?)</a>	Benchmark <a href="#">(What is this?)</a>	Name of Appendices with Tables or Figs of Results (Optional)
<i>Example</i>	<i>Fall / 2020 Spring / 2021</i>	<i>25 (pooled from 2 sections)</i>	<i>All majors enrolled in the 2 sections of the course (1 section in Fall and 1 section in Spring) were assessed. Non- majors were excluded.</i>	<i>The course instructor in each section completed all scoring using a standard 5-point rubric applied to both sections. Only criterion 1 (mapped to PSLO1) and criterion 3 (mapped to PSLO4) are reported for this year.</i>	<i>The means and standard deviations for the applicable rubric criteria are:  Criterion 1 (PSLO1): 3.5 +/- 0.5 Criterion 3 (PSLO4): 3.0 +/- 0.8  This shows that, on average, students performed better on the criterion aligned with PSLO1 than the criterion aligned with PSLO4.  From the frequency distribution (attached), the benchmark of 80% of students achieving a 3.0 or above was met for Criterion 1 was met but was not met for Criterion 3.</i>	<i>Fully Met: <input type="checkbox"/>  Partially Met: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  Not Met: <input type="checkbox"/>  N/A: <input type="checkbox"/></i>	<i>Appendix 1: SPIE 430 Final Paper Results</i>

# Program-level Student Learning Outcomes Results Report Template

Academic Degree Programs

University of Kentucky

1-DA	Fall / 2021- KHP 151 Spring/2022- KHP 577	196 (pooled from 9 sections)	All majors enrolled in KHP 151 (5 sections in Fall '21, 87 freshmen, 1 sophomore, 1 senior) and KHP 577 (4 sections in Spring '22, 29 juniors, 79 seniors) were assessed. Non-majors were excluded.	The assessment was administered via Canvas. The program chair completed all analysis based on correct answers chosen by students in all sections.	<p>The means and standard deviations and results of an unpaired t-test for the PSLO Quiz are:</p> <p>KHP 151 (pre-test, n = 88): 38 +/- 10.2 KHP 577 (post-test, n = 108): 58.5 +/- 20</p> <p>T-test (unpaired) = 2.96 E-16, p &lt; .001</p> <p>The percent of students that scored &gt; 80% correct are:</p> <p>KHP 151: 0% KHP 577: 12%</p> <p>This shows that, on average and statistically, students performed better on the PSLO quiz in KHP 577 when compared to the KHP 151 cohort.</p> <p>From the frequency distribution (attached), the benchmark of 80% correct was met by 12% of the KHP 577 student cohort and 0% of the KHP 151 cohort.</p> <p>Data for each questions can be found in Appendix 1.</p>	<p>Fully Met: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Partially Met: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Not Met: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>N/A: <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Appendix 1: PSLO Quiz and T-test PSLO Quiz; Figure 1.</p>
------	--	------------------------------------	---	--	--	--	--

# Program-level Student Learning Outcomes Results Report Template

Academic Degree Programs

University of Kentucky

<p>1-IA</p> <p>PSLO Quiz – Indirect Assessment</p>	<p>Fall / 2021-KHP 151 Spring/2022-KHP 577</p>	<p>196 (pooled from 9 sections)</p>	<p>All majors enrolled in KHP 151 (5 sections in Fall '21, 87 freshmen, 1 sophomore, 1 senior) and KHP 577 (4 sections in Spring '22, 29 juniors, 79 seniors) were assessed. Non-majors were excluded.</p>	<p>The assessment was administered via Canvas. The program chair completed all analysis based on correct answers chosen by students in all sections.</p>	<p>*45% of upperclassmen indicated being 80% Confident or Very Confident in 5 / 11 of the PSLO competencies assessed.</p> <p>Average confident or very confident scores for each cohort: Underclassmen: 53% Upperclassmen: 74.5%</p> <p>Percent of students indicating "Confident" or "Very Confident" to perform PSLO competencies, stratified by cohort.</p> <p>PSLO 3 (3.IA) Underclassmen: 55% Upperclassmen: 76%</p> <p>PSLO 4 (4.IA.1) Underclassmen: 62% Upperclassmen: 89%</p> <p>PSLO 4 (4.IA.2.1) Underclassmen: 65% Upperclassmen: 93%</p>	<p>Fully Met: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Partially Met: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Not Met: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>N/A: <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Appendix 1: PSLO Quiz; Figure 2.</p>
--	--	-------------------------------------	--	--	---	--	---

# Program-level Student Learning Outcomes Results Report Template

Academic Degree Programs

University of Kentucky

					<p>PSLO 4 (4.IA.2.2) Underclassmen: 45% Upperclassmen: 70%</p> <p>PSLO 4 (4.IA.2.3) Underclassmen: 38% Upperclassmen: 60%</p> <p>PSLO 4 (4.IA.2.4) Underclassmen: 43% Upperclassmen: 70%</p> <p>PSLO 4 (4.IA.2.5) Underclassmen: 41% Upperclassmen: 58%</p> <p>PSLO 4 (4.IA.2.6) Underclassmen: 27% Upperclassmen: 44%</p> <p>PSLO 5 (5.IA.1) Underclassmen: 62% Upperclassmen: 85%</p> <p>PSLO 6 (6.IA.1) Underclassmen: 76%</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

# Program-level Student Learning Outcomes Results Report Template

Academic Degree Programs

University of Kentucky

					Upperclassmen: 90%		
					PSLO 6 (6.IA.2) Underclassmen: 70% Upperclassmen: 84%		
2 Program Design Project	Spring/2022	93 (pooled from 3 sections)	All majors enrolled in KHP 350 were assessed. Non-majors were excluded. Students worked in small groups of 3-4 students, and all received the same grade. Students were offered the option of correcting their assessment for more credit as the formative portion of this assessment.	The course instructor in each section completed all scoring using a standard rubric applied to all sections.	The means and standard deviations are:  KHP 350 (N = 93): 88.6 +/- 12.4  The percent of students that scored > 80% on the project are:  80%	Fully Met: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  Partially Met: <input type="checkbox"/>  Not Met: <input type="checkbox"/>  N/A: <input type="checkbox"/>	Appendix 1: Program Design and EX Tech
3 Exercise Technique – Practical Evaluation	Spring/2022	30 (pooled from 1 section)	All majors enrolled in KHP 350 were assessed. Non-majors were excluded.	The course instructor did a one-on-one assessment of each student's ability to perform a resistance training exercise. A rubric was used to score ability.	The means and standard deviations are:  KHP 350 (N = 93): 91.8 +/- 18.1  The percent of students that scored > 80% on the project are:  97%	Fully Met: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  Partially Met: <input type="checkbox"/>  Not Met: <input type="checkbox"/>  N/A: <input type="checkbox"/>	Appendix 1: Program Design and EX Tech

# Program-level Student Learning Outcomes Results Report Template

Academic Degree Programs

University of Kentucky

<p>4 Practical Evaluation – Lab skills</p>	<p>Spring/2022</p>	<p>196 (pooled from 9 sections)</p>	<p>All majors enrolled in KHP 151 (5 sections in Fall '21, 87 freshmen, 1 sophomore, 1 senior) and KHP 577 (4 sections in Spring '22, 29 juniors, 79 seniors) were assessed. Non-majors were excluded.</p>	<p>The assessment was administered via Canvas. The program chair completed all analysis based on correct answers chosen by students in all sections.</p>	<p>Percent of students that got the questions correct:</p> <p>PSLO 4.A.1 Underclassmen: 11.2% Upperclassmen: 48.1%</p> <p>PSLO 4.A.2 Underclassmen: 44.9% Upperclassmen: 72.2%</p> <p>PSLO 4.A.3 Underclassmen: 31.5% Upperclassmen: 56.4%</p>	<p>Fully Met: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Partially Met: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Not Met: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>N/A: <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Appendix 1: PSLO Quiz</p>
<p>5 Written Communication</p>	<p>Spring/2022</p>	<p>120 (pooled from 4 sections)</p>	<p>All majors enrolled in KHP 300 were assessed. Non-majors were excluded.</p>	<p>The course instructor completed scoring of all writing assessments. The average of score of all writing assignments per student are reported.</p>	<p>The means and standard deviations are:</p> <p>KHP 300 (N = 120): 90 +/- 17.8</p> <p>The percent of students that scored &gt; 80% on the project are:</p> <p>83%</p>	<p>Fully Met: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Partially Met: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Not Met: <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>N/A: <input type="checkbox"/></p>	

# Program-level Student Learning Outcomes Results Report Template

Academic Degree Programs

University of Kentucky

6 Oral Communication	Spring/2022	166 (pooled from 4 sections)	All majors enrolled in KHP 577 were assessed. Non-majors were excluded.	The course instructor completed scoring of all oral assessments.	The means and standard deviations are:  KHP 577 (N = 166): 93.7 +/- 16.7  The percent of students that scored > 80% on the project are:  93%	Fully Met: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  Partially Met: <input type="checkbox"/>  Not Met: <input type="checkbox"/>  N/A: <input type="checkbox"/>	
----------------------------	-------------	------------------------------------	--	---	---	---	--

## **(OPTIONAL) NOTES TO GUIDE FUTURE REFLECTION – Action Plan and Documenting Improvements**

This section provides an opportunity to, optionally, provide an initial reflection and interpretation of the PSLO results and process or potential next steps. The full reflection report will be submitted in Year 3 (22-23), unless the program is following an agreed-upon custom cycle to align with its specialized accreditor. Although not required, this space could be helpful for guiding any initial departmental conversations around the PSLO data and process as well as providing continuity to a new program director, DGS, or DUS.



# Program-level Student Learning Outcomes Results Report Template

Academic Degree Programs

University of Kentucky

**Writing Action Plans:** Programs should explain their process for sharing and using assessment results to make decisions in areas such as curriculum, pedagogy, and other aspects that impact learning. The strength of assessment is not that it provides quick fixes for a problem, but that it promotes active, informed, and systematic improvement of a program through discussion among faculty. This is an opportunity to review student learning data and make decisions as a program.

Action plans should report just that, intended actions. Plans to discuss data are not sufficient action items. Work with your program to review results, interpret information, and draft appropriate action plans. Consider the following questions:

- How is assessment information about the quality of learning shared and used for program decision making in areas such as curriculum, pedagogy, and other aspects that impact learning?
- What actions do the results suggest need to be implemented?
- What concrete actions will the program take to sustain or improve this outcome? What is the timeframe of these actions?

Example:

Assessment information was reviewed and discussed [a] at a curriculum committee meeting. The curriculum annually reviews this information and recommends changes to the curriculum, pedagogy, or other aspects that impact learning. These recommendations are shared with the chair and the faculty. Based on our discussions, partially met targets related to written communication and theory evaluation, and additional departmental information, the program will [b] create a repository of model assignments and assessments related to the written communication and theory evaluation program outcomes. This repository is to be collaboratively developed by faculty and will serve as a guide in addition to the syllabus for future faculty teaching this required course. This action plan will be completed by [c] before the start of the fall semester with the help of [c] three lead faculty teaching UK 123.

- describe process for using results/describe process for decision making – e.g. changes and recommendations about curriculum, pedagogy, or other aspects that impact learning are made
- describe actions
- timeframe/persons responsible

# Program-level Student Learning Outcomes Results Report Template

Academic Degree Programs

University of Kentucky

## Action Plan:

Assessment information will be reviewed and will be discussed [a] at the fall curriculum committee meeting in August 2022. The curriculum committee annually reviews this information and recommends changes to the curriculum, pedagogy, benchmarks, or other aspects that impact learning. Their recommendations are shared with the chair and the faculty. Partially met targets related to objective 2 (competency in exercise science), creation of standardized rubrics to assess oral presentations, written assignments, practical skill observation, benchmarks, and any additional changes will [b] be discussed with the curriculum committee, and an action plan on who will be responsible for creation of the rubrics and the courses in which they are implemented will be determined. A repository of model rubrics for the program design projects, oral presentations, and written assignments will be created and implemented. A discussion on creating at least 1 additional measure for PSLO 1 will also occur. This action plan will be completed by [c] Rosie Lanphere before the start of the fall 2022 semester with the help of lead instructors (respective courses) who are [c] Lance Bollinger (KHP 577), Marta Mack-Washington (KHP 300), Jill Day (KHP 300), Mark Abel (KHP 350), and Stuart Best (KHP 350).

# Program-level Student Learning Outcomes Results Report Template

Academic Degree Programs

University of Kentucky

**Documenting Improvements:** A well written improvement includes three parts 1) a recap of the data/context that spurred action, 2) a description of the actions taken, 3) subsequent expected or reported results. Consider answering the following questions:

- What changes were made during the year or in previous years that impacted student learning? (This can be related to PSLO results or Periodic Review activities)
- Why were the changes made? (e.g., the student learning outcome and the information that prompted action)
- What impact did this have on student learning?

**Example:**


[a] After seeing poor performance on the comprehensive exam over the past three years in research methods and analysis, strategies were recommended by the Curriculum and Assessment Committee and implemented by faculty. [b] Over the past two years, faculty teaching the Introduction to Research course as well as Qualitative Methods 1 and Statistics in Research courses put additional emphasis on design and rationale for methodology. Specifically, the Introduction to Research course added a methods assignment and enhanced the rigor of the methods section in the final paper. The Qualitative Methods 1 and Statistics in Research courses both added a critique assignment to help students further develop these skills. [c] This is the first year that students with these modifications have gone through the comprehensive exam. Exam scores were higher in the research methods and analysis areas than previous year.

- a. describe data or circumstance that prompted action and specify student learning outcome
- b. list completed action plans or modifications to the program
- c. compare results before and after modification

# Program-level Student Learning Outcomes Results Report Template

Academic Degree Programs

University of Kentucky

A large, empty rectangular box with a thin black border, occupying the central portion of the page. It is intended for the user to input data or text related to the report's content.

# Program-level Student Learning Outcomes Results Report Template

Academic Degree Programs

University of Kentucky

After reviewing the 2020-2021 feedback from the OSPIE, changes were made to our 2021-2022 assessments.

[a] The PSLO Quiz had a limited number of questions (29) in the '20-'21 assessment. With the feedback we received and to improve reliability of our instrument, we decided to increase the quiz to 60 multiple choice questions for our direct assessment of knowledge and 11 indirect questions which asked about the student's confidence levels in several observable traits. We also increased and stratified our sample size to include courses where there were typically, only freshmen or senior students enrolled. Only 12% (N = 108) of our upperclassmen cohort reached the benchmark of scoring >80% on the quiz, 0% underclassmen reached this benchmark (N = 88). [b] The benchmark of >80% was chosen based on the example from OSPIE, thus, we will consider changing the benchmark to represent longitudinal learning in our students in which a greater generalization can be made (i.e., 40% of the upperclassmen students scored >70% this reporting period). Other benchmarks could include statistical analysis of the underclassmen and upperclassmen cohorts or a true longitudinal study of their progress in the future. These changes warrant discussion among the program faculty and department chair. One recommendation that we did not quite address is to report the scores/percent correct for the items that align with PSLO1 separately from PSLO2 to improve alignment. PSLO1 is our main objective however, the questions available to measure it reliably are limited and an improved measurement instrument or procedure needs to be invented. [c] Prior to modifications made this year, underclassmen cohorts assessed (N=6, 42.9% correct, +/- 19.5, 0% >80%) were like upperclassmen cohorts assessed (N=24, 52.8% correct, +/- 19, 10.5% > 80%).

[a] Upon reviewing the data for oral presentations and writing assignments (PSLO 6), it was noticeable that there was not a distribution of grades that would show rigorous and consistent grading between or within instructors. The percent of students scoring >80% on the oral assignment was 93% and on the written assessment it was 83%, which is very high. It appears several instructors gave blanket scores for completion and not necessarily for the quality of the product turned in. I also do not believe that a standardized rubric was used to score these assignments which is also problematic when interpreting, analyzing, and reporting the data. Studies have shown that the importance of rigorous grading and high expectations significantly increase the odds that students will complete college and their performances in subsequent classes up to two years later. [b] Standardized rubrics need to be implemented to ensure the quality of oral presentation skills and written assignments. [c] The results from the '20-'21 report were as follows: 56.9% and 94.9% of students scored >80% on their written and oral assessments, respectively.

# Program-level Student Learning Outcomes Results Report Template

Academic Degree Programs

University of Kentucky

[a] It was suggested by OSPIE that each PSLO only needs to be assessed and results reported 1x either in Year 1 or Year 2. [b] We have decided to report them for both years so we may work out any issues in our measurement instruments, data collection methods, analysis, reporting etc.

[a] The assessment to measure PSLO4 (demonstrate skill in exercise technique, physical fitness, and health assessments) was improved with the addition of multiple-choice questions this reporting period which improved the reliability. However, we would still like to implement a practical skills assessment in KHP 450: Introduction to Exercise Testing and Prescription, and all sections of KHP 350 (N=93, 97% scored >80%). Three questions included on the PSLO quiz were analyzed for correctness. In this case, upperclassmen (48.1%, 72.2%, 56.4%) outscored the underclassmen (11.2%, 44.9%, 31.5%) on items 4.A.1, 4.A.2, and 4.A.3, respectively (N = 196). With the uncertainty of the pandemic and the requirements for 6-foot spacing, mask-wearing, cleaning protocols etc., we postponed implementing this assessment this school year. [b] We plan to implement new assessments in Fall 2022 and Spring 2023 in KHP 450 and KHP 350 with clear guidelines on student expectations and grading rubrics. [c] The assessment in KHP 450 was postponed thus, no comparable results are available. In Spring 2021, 87% of students (N=24) scored >80% on the KHP 350 skills practical.

## FEEDBACK AND SUPPORT ON PSLO RESULTS REPORT

---

Each program has the option of receiving formative feedback on its PSLO assessment report from OSPIE staff members. If your program would like to receive feedback on its assessment report, please indicate below:

- Yes, we would like to receive feedback.
- No thank you, not at this time.

# Program-level Student Learning Outcomes Results Report Template

Academic Degree Programs

University of Kentucky

## (OPTIONAL) RESULTS DATA TABLES AND FIGURES

---

If desired, the program faculty/staff may copy and paste results tables and figures in the space below or upload them as separate appendices.




Figure 1. Pre-test (underclassmen) and post-test (upperclassmen) data for 1-DA from KHP 151: Introduction to KHP and KHP 577: Practicum for Kinesiology and Health Promotion. T-test analysis showed that the students' performance statistically increased (\* $p < .001$ ) in KHP 577 when compared to the KHP 151 cohort.

# Program-level Student Learning Outcomes Results Report Template

Academic Degree Programs

University of Kentucky




Figure 2. Indirect assessment data for 1-IA from KHP 151: Introduction to KHP and KHP 577: Practicum for Kinesiology and Health Promotion. The mean percentage of students that indicated being “confident” or “very confident” in their observable skills and traits. Data is reported as the mean for each item.