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## HUMAN PERFORMANCE

### TEACH A TOPIC: THE STUDENT WILL BE ABLE TO TEACH A PHYSICAL ACTIVITY CLASS AND OR CONCEPT FROM A STUDENT DERIVED LESSON PLAN TO A GROUP OF EXERCISE ENTHUSIASTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Author(s)</th>
<th>sophie mabry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1 Type:</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1 Description:</td>
<td>Juried evaluation of student products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1 Sample Size:</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) **Describe the benchmark for this measure.**

85% of the students earn a 85% or better score.

2) **What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?**

Students will be asked to teach classes once employed. They have to plan a cognitive, psychomotor, and affective goal for physical activity classes, which requires some thought and time. It needs to be age/gender and ability level appropriate. The student needs to execute this plan to another person rather than a classmate. The percentage correlates to national standards and exams and job placement in the industry.
**Measure 2**

**Description:** Once the lesson plan is created, the student needs to deliver the lesson by teaching the class to a group of individuals then evaluate the success and any changes the next time they teach. Plan, teach, evaluate, plan, teach, evaluate and the cycle continues.

**Sample Size:** 15

1) **Describe the benchmark for this measure.**

- 85% of students score better than or equal to 85%

2) **What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?**

Students will be asked to teach classes once employed and during the interview process. They have to plan a cognitive, psychomotor, and affective goal for physical activity classes, which requires some thought and time. It needs to be age/gender and ability level appropriate. The student needs to execute this plan to another person rather than a classmate. The percentage correlates to national standards and exams and job placement in the industry.

**This Discipline Outcome was:** Missed benchmark

**Measure 1 Results:** 53% of the students were able to write a group exercise lesson plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Of all students n=15</th>
<th>85% of students score better &gt;85%</th>
<th>85% students score less ≤85%</th>
<th>Did not participate (withdraw, drop, no show, did not turn in project)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intended Learning Outcome #1 (Write Lesson Plan)</td>
<td>8/15 students (53%)</td>
<td>7/15 students (47%)</td>
<td>0/15 students (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measure 2**

73% of the students were able to effectively teach a group exercise class.
### Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results:</th>
<th>Of all students n=15</th>
<th>85% of students score better &gt;85%</th>
<th>85% of students score less ≤85%</th>
<th>Did not participate (withdraw, drop, no show, did not turn in project)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intended Learning Outcome #1 (Teach Lesson Plan)</td>
<td>11/15 students (73%)</td>
<td>4/15 students (27%)</td>
<td>0/15 students (0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results:</th>
<th>Of the students who participated n=15</th>
<th>85% of students score better &gt;85%</th>
<th>85% of students score less ≤85%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intended Learning Outcome #1 (Teach Lesson Plan)</td>
<td>11/15 students (73%)</td>
<td>4/15 students (27%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?**

   Our scores were a little lower than in past years.

2. **How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?**

   Our scores were a little lower than last year due to the fact that the students were not beat driven nor had a vested interest in teaching beat driven classes. The majority of students were not vested in teaching group exercise as a career path, therefore did not value the need and importance of learning and applying these skills.

3. **If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?**

   Grading rubric and teaching practical were similar to one another in that if the student wrote a weak lesson plan, they taught a weak lesson.

---

1. **Based on**

   Missed benchmark

---

the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?

After careful review the EHS program will be adding a new concentration to the program, which allows students who are interested in pursuing group exercise instruction as a career path to take the course and be successful with the competencies. For the students who are not vested in this area, a new and different academic concentration will be added for them.

3) How will your assessment results enable you to improve institutional processes or academic instruction in order to support, facilitate and/or stimulate student learning?

More time will be spent on pedagogical techniques and motivational skills. This will allow additional time for hands on practice in the design, choreography and delivery of pedagogical skills. A flipped classroom will be considered maximizing hands on time for the students.

Further Action:

Further Action Planned

Describe the action plan:

The EHS program has proposed a new class as part of a program/graduation requirement that will allow us to spend more time with the students in developing their pedagogical techniques and classroom presence. More time will be spent teaching and evaluating performance. A flipped classroom is being explored. By having a credit class dedicated to the skills and methods of teaching group fitness we will be able to target both choreography, beat driven classes and non beat driven
classes such as spinning and bootcamp. A very exciting and needed addition to the program.

Person/ Group responsible for action: sophie mabry

Target Date for implementation of the action: 08/28/2015

Priority: High

---

**NUTRIENT CONTENT ANALYSIS: THE STUDENT WILL BE ABLE TO ANALYZE THE NUTRIENT CONTENT IN A DIET AND CONDUCT A NUTRITIONAL ASSESSMENT**

**Assessment Author(s):** sophie mabry

**Measure 1 Type:**
- Direct

**Measure 1 Description:** The student will be able to conduct, analyze a nutritional assessment and provide nutritional guidance within the boundaries and scope of practice as a movement practitioner. Technology, math calculations and technical writing skills will be addressed as students learn to use professional software.

**Measure 1 Sample Size:** 28

1) **Describe the benchmark for this measure.**

75% of students will score, better than equal to or less than 75% while conducting & analyzing a nutritional assessment.

2) **What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?**

Using the 75% percentile lines up with national standards and certification process. allows room for growth and consideration to students who are not interested nor do intend to focus on nutrition as part of their career.

**Please select**

This Discipline Outcome was: Missed benchmark

**Measure 1 Results:** 61% of the students were able to conduct a nutritional assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Of all students n=28</th>
<th>75% of students score better &gt;75%</th>
<th>75% of students score less &lt;75%</th>
<th>Did not participate (withdraw drop, no show, dic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Measure 2 Results:

94% of the students were able to analyze nutrient content.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 2 Results:</th>
<th>75% of students score better</th>
<th>75% of students score less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of all students n=28</td>
<td>17/28 students (61%)</td>
<td>1/28 students (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended Learning Outcome #1 (Analyze nutrient content)</th>
<th>17/28 students (61%)</th>
<th>1/28 students (3%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of the students who participated n= 18</td>
<td>75% of students score better</td>
<td>75% of students score less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17/18 students (94%)</td>
<td>1/18 students (6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?

We came up short due to campus wide computer-technology glitches and upgrades.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?

Slightly lower due to campus wide technology glitches and upgrades.

3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

There is a strong correlation to students success and ability to access computers and software.

1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong –

Missed benchmark
2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?

The biggest problem we encountered is that while students were working on their assignments & projects our IT department was running upgrades that ended up having several glitches. Due to the glitches our students were unable or had extreme difficulty in completing this competency. It took nearly 3 weeks to fix this internal problem and it turns out the timing occurred with four weeks left in the academic year.

3) How will your assessment results enable you to improve institutional processes or academic instruction in order to support, facilitate and/or stimulate student learning?

We have asked IT not to run an upgrade on Citrix during finals and have gotten them involved early on in the semester in hopes of being proactive with any glitches this year.

Further Action:

Further Action Planned

Describe the action plan:

Be proactive and make IT aware of student needs.

Person/Group responsible for action

Sophie Mabry

Target Date for implementation of the action

08/24/2015

Priority

High

CPR/PR/AED RTE BB CERTIFIED: THE STUDENT WILL BE ABLE TO RECEIVE CERTIFICATION IN CPR/PR/AED
### COMMUNICATION: THE STUDENT WILL BE ABLE TO WRITE AN EXERCISE PROGRAM USING TECHNICAL WRITING SKILLS.

**A.** For a symptomatic – stable individual in a non-clinical setting. **B.** For an asymptomatic stable individual in a non-clinical setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Author(s)</th>
<th>Sophie Mabry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1 Type:</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1 Description:</td>
<td>The student will be able to write an exercise program using technical writing skills for a stable symptomatic and non-symptomatic client in a non-clinical environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1 Sample Size:</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.</td>
<td>75% of the students should earn a score greater than 70%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?</td>
<td>In order for students to demonstrate average proficiency in mastering national level knowledge and abilities as stated by the American College of Sports Medicine and be eligible for their national exam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**This Learning Outcome was:** Surpassed benchmark

**Measure 1 Results:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Of all students n=16</th>
<th>75% of students score</th>
<th>75% of students score</th>
<th>Did not participate (withdraw)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;tbody&gt; &lt;/tbody&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Measure 2 Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended Learning Outcome #1 (Write Exercise Prescription)</th>
<th>better ≥70%</th>
<th>less ≤70%</th>
<th>drop, no show, did not turn in project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/16 students (75%)</td>
<td>4/16 students (25%)</td>
<td>0/16 students (0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measure 2 Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Of the students who participated n=16</th>
<th>75% of students score better ≥70%</th>
<th>75% of student score less ≤70%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14/16 students (88%)</td>
<td>2/16 students (13%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Questions and Findings:

1) **How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?**

   The benchmark was met. 88% of the students successfully wrote an exercise prescription.

2) **How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?**

   The scores this year are higher than in past years.

3) **If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?**

   N/A

1) **Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome**

   Surpassed benchmark
2) How does this assessment affect plans for the coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?

The program will continue to advocate the use of the student success center, and continue to implement the first and second year student course sequence. Placement test scores are now a requirement for the class and has proven to benefit the quality work students turn in.

A flipped 15 week course is being considered.

Further Action: Further Action Planned

Describe the action plan: A 15 week flipped classroom is being considered as it allows students more time to in assignments while allowing them more hands on classroom time to develop essential skills.

Person/ Group responsible for action Sophie Mabry

Target Date for implementation of the action 08/24/2015

Priority High

INFORMATION MANAGEMENT: THE STUDENT WILL BE ABLE TO DEMONSTRATE THE ABILITY TO DETERMINE RISK STRATIFICATION AND COMPLETE NECESSARY PAPERWORK WHEN WORKING IN THE FIELD OF KINESIOLOGY UTILIZING THEIR READING AND COMPREHENSIVE SKILLS. A. ABILITY TO ADMINISTER PAPERWORK, B. ABILITY TO EVALUATE PAPERWORK

Assessment Author(s) Sophie Mabry

Measure 1 Type: Direct

Measure 1 Description: The student will be able to demonstrate the ability to determine risk stratification &
complete necessary paperwork when working in the field of Kinesiology by administrating and evaluating legal & medical paperwork.

Measure 1  
Sample Size: 16

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure. 65% of the student completing the class will achieve a score higher than 80%.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark? Based on ACSM job task analysis obtaining an 80% or higher is considered entry level proficiency for the novice professional.

Please select

This Learning Outcome was: Surpassed benchmark

Measure 1  
Results: 88% of the students were able to administer legal and medical paperwork with entry level job skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Of all students n=16</th>
<th>65% of students score better &gt;80%</th>
<th>65% of students score less &lt;80%</th>
<th>Did not participate (withdraw, drop, no show, did not turn in project)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intended Learning Outcome #1 (Administer paperwork)</td>
<td>14/16 students (88%)</td>
<td>2/16 students (12%)</td>
<td>0/16 students (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Of the students who participated n=16</th>
<th>65% of students score better &gt;65%</th>
<th>65% of students score less ≤65%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intended Learning Outcome #1 (Administer paperwork)</td>
<td>14/16 students (88%)</td>
<td>2/16 students (12%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measure 2  
Results: 88% of the students were able to interpret the medical & legal paperwork with efficiency.
### Assessment Plan Data for Organizations

**Of all students**
- n=16
- 65% of students score better >65%
- 65% of students score less <65%
- Did not participate (withdraw, drop, no show, did not turn in project)

**Intended Learning Outcome #1**
- (Interpret paperwork)
- 14/16 students (88%)
- 2/16 students (12%)
- 0/16 students (0%)

**Of the students who participated**
- n=16
- 65% of students score better >65%
- 65% of students score less <65%

**Intended Learning Outcome #1**
- (Interpret paperwork)
- 14/16 students (88%)
- 2/16 students (12%)

1) **How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?**
   - This year the program surpassed our benchmark.

2) **How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?**
   - In previous years our average was 57% that increased to 88% this year in part because of placement testing pre-requisites.

3) **If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?**
   - N/A

1) **Based on the findings, how does the unit/department**
   - Surpassed benchmark
rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?

The program will continue to advocate the use of the student success center, Placement testing pre-requisites, first and second year course sequence.

Further Action:

Further Action Planned

Describe the action plan:

A 15 week flipped classroom is being considered.

Person/ Group responsible for action

Sophie Mabry

Target Date for implementation of the action

08/24/2015

Priority

Medium