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A. Program Student Learning Outcomes

See attached.

B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed

Integrate and synthesize knowledge from general education courses and courses in the biological, physical, social and health sciences.

C. Summary of Assessment Process

Assessment was completed using Blackboard. There was nearly a year delay between the faculty evaluation of the artifacts and the availability of results due to a Blackboard problem. Future use of the Blackboard system should not have delays. To assess critical thinking, the faculty relied on the final student paper in the HSC capstone class, HSC 4500. Student papers were randomly sampled across all sections of HSC 4500. Each sampled paper was read twice by two different faculty members. Papers were evaluated based on the Health Sciences rubric for critical thinking. Final results were computed and provided through the Blackboard assessment tool.

D. Summary of Assessment Results

Full assessment results are attached. While students seemed to be able, generally, to evaluate evidence and to analyze health science issues; there was a deficiency in ability to state a position on an issue and to draw conclusions and implications. This assessment data is based on a cohort of students who completed the program before the core 3000-level courses were redesigned with a Promising Practices grant from the Chancellor’s Office. Health Sciences is re-assessing papers from Spring 2016 using the same rubric. Our hope is that the students’ will have improved based on the redesign. If not, the faculty will discuss how to improve student learning in this area.

E. Suggestions and Recommendations for the CSCI EETF in the Future
### PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

**2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students graduating with A (INSERT DEGREE) from Cal State East Bay will be able to:</th>
<th>I.L.O Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Integrate and synthesize knowledge from general education courses and courses in the biological, physical, social and health sciences.</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Communicate effectively in the provision of healthcare services to the community.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work effectively as individuals, teams, partnerships and larger groups toward accomplishing healthcare goals.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Apply ethics and professional standards to interactions with colleagues, supervisors and staff, diverse and multicultural clients, and with the general public.</td>
<td>3, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Evaluate scientific and policy research to solve problems in the healthcare sciences.</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Overview
- Current Instrument Name: PLO_HSCBS_1_SMITH_07-15
- Rubric Name: HSC PLO 1 Critical Thinking
- Rubric Description
- Total Evaluations: 78
- Begin Date: Jan 1, 1970
- End Date: Jan 27, 2016

Rubric Overall Performance
Points Possible: 24.00

Average Rubric Performance: 14.59
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Rubric Analysis
HSC PLO 1 Critical Thinking

- Explanation of issues (HSC: Health care systems thinking): Possible 4.00, Actual 2.74
- Interdisciplinary Approach (HSC: interdisciplinary approach): Possible 4.00, Actual 2.40
- Quality of Evidence: Possible 4.00, Actual 2.58
- Analysis (HSC: Ability to evaluate evidence): Possible 4.00, Actual 2.43
- Statement of Position: Possible 4.00, Actual 2.35
- Conclusions and Implications: Possible 4.00, Actual 2.15

Frequency Distribution

Average Score per Criteria
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## Evidence Set Evaluation Rollup

### HSC PLO 1 Critical Thinking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Skilled</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Number Evaluation</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of issues (HSC: Health care systems thinking)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Approach (HSC: interdisciplinary approach)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis (HSC: Ability to evaluate evidence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions and Implications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>