Course Outcomes Assessment

Course/Program Title: DHY 220 Dental Hygiene Theory IV   **Date:** 5/3/18
Course/Program Team: Marlaina Lantzy RDH, MS

Expected Learning Outcomes:
1. Discuss preparation skills and application processes for the successful completion of the National Board Dental Hygiene Examination (NBDHE) and the American Dental Hygiene Licensing Examination (ADHLEX) for licensure.
2. Examine the process of preparing for an entry level dental hygiene job, establishing professional affiliations and implementing practice management strategies.
3. Assess oral and systemic healthcare treatment modifications for special needs patients.

Assessment: (How do or will students demonstrate achievement of each outcome? Please attach a copy of your assessment electronically.)

	Points	Weighted Total
Resume & Cover Letter (50 points each)	100	15%
Private Practice Observation Paper	30	12%
Professional Meeting Reflection Papers (2@15points each)	30	6%
Portfolio Rough Draft	15	5%
Exams (3@50 points each)	150	40%
CDCA & NBDHE Quizzes (2@20points each)	40	6%
Portfolio	100	11%
Classroom Engagement	75	5%
Total	**540 points**	**100%**

1. Resume and Cover Letter: Students create a draft and final version of original cover letters and resumes which help them prepare for interviews and obtaining employment. These two projects are 15% of the total course grade.

2. Exams: Three tests are given throughout the semester, which include lecture material, homework, and reading assignments that cover the practice and theory of dental hygiene and prepare student to take the National Dental Hygiene Board Exam (NBDHE). The three exams are 40% of the total course grade.

3. Portfolio: The Portfolio Project is designed as a comprehensive project that is compiled over a series of drafts during the three semesters of Theory II, III and IV. The Portfolio project is intended to: 1. Serve as an alternative measure of student competency to practice dental hygiene. This project is a compilation of clinical and didactic work completed throughout entire program. 2. Serve as an organizational career resource for managing licensure and a showcase of accomplishments for potential employers. The final version of this project is 11% of the total course grade.

Validation: (What methods have you used or will you use to validate your assessment?)
1. Resume and Cover Letter: Students work with the lead instructor to submit drafts and then final versions of each document. The lead instructor evaluates the quality of each document based on a grading rubric and provides written feedback to students. Students are required to include both documents in their Portfolio. **(90% of students achieve an average of 80% or higher on the Cover Letter and Resume)**

2. Exams: Exams are constructed based on current evidence based practices and board exam content. An item analysis is conducted by the lead instructor to validate each exam. **(90% of students achieve an average of 75% or higher on the average of all exams)**

3. Portfolio: During Theory II, III and IV one or two drafts of small sections of the final project are required coursework. The lead instructor grades each draft section with a grading rubric and provides written feedback for improvement. During Theory IV, the final Portfolio Project is evaluated using a grading rubric that is available to students in each of the 3 theory courses as they work towards project completion.   **(100% of students achieve a final score of 80% of higher on the final Portfolio submission)**

Results: (What do your assessment data show? If you have not yet assessed student achievement of your learning outcomes, when is assessment planned?)

I have chosen to compare data from the first 3 cohorts to analyze results, second year classes were not offered in Spring 2015.

1. Resume and Cover Letter: Student performance on the Resume and Cover Letter assignments improved approximately 5% compared to the first 2 cohorts. This improvement is most likely due to the following changes that were made this year: a guest speaker who specializes in dental resumes and cover letters presented to the class for 2 hours; the students were required to submit rough drafts of their resume and cover letter after the guest speaker presentation; a final draft was due at the end of the semester. **(16/18, or 88% of students, scored a 80% or higher on the Cover Letter and Resume)**

2. Exams: Student performance on exams is consistent between the first 3 cohorts; with about a 2% variation between averages over 3 years. **(18/18, or 100% of students, achieved a 75% or higher on the average of all three exams. Range of exam averages: 100%-89%)**

3. Portfolio: The Portfolio project continues to be revised each year in an attempt to be a meaningful tool for both faculty and students. Changes to the project for Spring 2018 were a continuation of the changes made last year: additional revisions to grading rubrics for each draft and the final product; samples of what was expected for each section were created and disseminated by the instructor to better guide students regarding project expectations; a further decrease in required content in order to allow student to focus more on the quality of the work produced; and a greater number of smaller drafts being required before submission of the final project. **(18 out of 18, or 100% of students, achieved a final score of 80% of higher on the final Portfolio submission)**

The data for the 3 measures discussed above is presented in the following table.

Cohort	Resume Average	Cover Letter Average	Exam Average (3 per semester)	Portfolio Average	Final Course Grade Distribution
Sp' 15 (n=0)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sp '16 (n=17)	90%	58%	89.06%	94.47%	A- 10 B-6 C-1
Sp '17 (n=19)	87.26%	90.32%	86.29%	86.58%	A-8 B-11
Sp '18 (n=18)	92.06%	96.44%	87.44%	93.38%	A-12 B-5 C-1

Follow-up: (How have you used or how will you use the data to improve student learning?)

1. Resume and Cover Letters: As stated above, changes to improve student outcomes for these projects were made between 2017 and 2017. As a whole, the third cohort submitted a higher quality of work; the lead instructor believes that the guest speaker and mandatory rough drafts were crucial in helping the students produce a higher quality of work. There was outstanding feedback from students about the guest speaker, Maryann McTighe, she should be invited back next year.

2. Exams: Average exam scores improved by 1%, after a 3% decrease in 2017. This is likely due to the course being taught a second time with the textbook that was adopted in 2017 and revision of course content after the second cohort.

3. Portfolio: The Portfolio project contents, format and requirements will continue to be revised and improved as each cohort completes the project. Changes for the 4th cohort should include strategies to generate more student "buy-in" about the project from the very beginning. The major flaw in the projects is a lack of student interest, most likely due to the fact that students do not view the assignment as important to them.

4. Weight of Assignments and Grade Distribution: The weight of assignments and exams is reviewed each year to ensure points awarded are distributed appropriately and accurately measure student learning. All Spring 2018 dental hygiene classes switched to a weighted grade scale in order to compensate to the current program grade scale.   The program grade scale is currently 75%-79% =C, 80%-89%=B and 90%-100%=A. This is not an even distribution and is artificially inflating grades into the A and B range. The program grading scale should be evaluated and adjusted for a more even scale which would in turn create a more accurate grade distribution in a Bell Curve with A's, B's and C's.

5. Student Learning Outcomes and Program Competencies: The Learning Outcomes listed on the Master Syllabus need to be reviewed to ensure they are measurable and descriptive of what the course is designed to accomplish.   Additionally, the 7 major program competencies and sub-competencies need to be evaluated and revised for accuracy. This was suggested in the Program Manual Revisions meeting with Drs. Ohl-Giglotti, Weaver and D'Ambrisi in April 2017. Revising the program competencies, outcomes and goals will better align SLOA, curriculum management and accreditation maintenance.

Budget Justification: (What resources are necessary to improve student learning?)
No additional resources are needed at this point. Continued support from HCC to allow students to attend board review activities on and off campus will continue to assist students in successful completion of licensure examinations.