

VII.B. Goal #2: Foster Professionalism within a student supportive learning environment.

Data Sources/Timing and Frequency of Collection & Analysis/Committee or Persons Responsible for Data Collection and Data Analysis:

	Name of Data Source	Collection of Data	Analysis of Data	Committee/Person Responsible for Data Collection	Committee Responsible for Analysis
#1	Professionalism Rubric – Didactic Courses	End of Each Semester	August, annually	Progression and Promotion Committee	Data Analytics Committee
#2	Professionalism Scores in SCPEs	End of Each Semester	August, annually	Progression and Promotion Committee	Data Analytics Committee
#3	Student Learning Environment Survey (for second year students)	1 st week of September, annually	2 nd – 4 th weeks of September, annually	Data Analytics Committee	Data Analytics Committee
#4	Preceptor Evaluation of Student Readiness to Enter Profession	During 7 th and 8 th SCPE, annually	August, annually	Director of Clinical Education	Data Analytics Committee
#5	DEIAB Survey	August, annually	September, annually	Data Analytics Committee	Data Analytics Committee

VII.B.1. Data Source #1: Professionalism Rubric

Rationale for Benchmark: Establishing a benchmark that the aggregate cohort score on the professionalism rubric embedded in each didactic course will be equal to or greater than 65 (out of 75 points) reflects the program's commitment to developing professional behaviors early and consistently throughout the curriculum. This benchmark allows the program to monitor professionalism longitudinally, not just during clinical experiences, but also during the foundational didactic phase. A score of 65 represents a high level of professional behavior, indicating that students consistently demonstrate respect, accountability, integrity, and engagement in the academic setting. By embedding

the rubric into all didactic courses, the program ensures frequent and consistent evaluation across instructors and courses, which enhances reliability and informs ongoing formative feedback. Furthermore, tracking aggregate scores for professionalism allows faculty to identify trends within a cohort and intervene if systemic concerns arise. Meeting or exceeding this benchmark supports ARC-PA Standards and assists in the preparation of students for the expectations of the clinical phase and entry into the physician associate profession.

Sources for Triangulation of Data: Preceptor Evaluation of Student Preparedness to Enter Clinical Phase, Faculty and Staff Survey data related to professionalism of students, Professionalism scores in SCPEs.

Data Source: Professionalism Rubric		
Benchmark for Quantitative Data	Identification of Areas in Need of Improvement	Identification of Areas of Strength
80% of students score ≥ 65 points in the Professionalism Rubric for Didactic Courses.	$< 80\%$ of students score ≥ 65 points in the Professionalism Rubric for Didactic Courses for two consecutive years.	$> 80\%$ of students score ≥ 65 points in the Professionalism Rubric for Didactic Courses for two consecutive years.

VII.B.2. Data Source #2: Professionalism Scores in SCPEs

Rationale for Benchmark: The benchmark for professionalism in SCPEs ensures that students consistently demonstrate expected professional behaviors during their clinical training and is aligned with **ARC-PA standards** which require programs to promote and assess professionalism. By using this benchmark, the program can identify areas for intervention if professionalism issues emerge at clinical sites, ensure consistency across SCPEs, and support continuous development of professional behaviors that are essential to working in the physician associate profession.

Sources for Triangulation of Data: Preceptor Evaluation of Students, Professional conduct reports, Professionalism Rubric performance in didactic phase, Preceptor Evaluation of Student Preparedness to Enter the Clinical Phase and Preceptor Evaluation of Student Readiness to Enter Profession.

Data Source: Preceptor EOR Evaluation of Students		
Benchmark for Quantitative Data	Identification of Areas in Need of Improvement	Identification of Areas of Strength
80% of students score a 3 ("expectations met") or above on each of the items under Professionalism.	<80% of students score a 3 ("expectations met") or below on each of the items under Professionalism for two consecutive years.	>80% of students score a 3 ("expectations met") or above on each of the items under Professionalism for two consecutive years.

VII.B.3. Data Source #3: Student Learning Environment Survey

Survey Constructs (Concepts to Measure): A) Support from Program Faculty and Staff and B) Program Culture and Environment

Rationale for Benchmarks: See #4 and #5 on Key Principles Guiding the Assessment Plan.

Sources for Triangulation of Data: Student exit surveys and interviews, faculty advisement documentation, student focus group minutes, attrition data (to include leave of absence), remediation data.

Data Source: Student Learning Environment Survey			
Benchmark for Quantitative Data	Benchmark for Qualitative Data	Identification of Areas in Need of Improvement	Identification of Areas of Strength
A median score of 4 for items under construct A and item #9 under construct B.	The same theme is present in ≥10% responses to open-ended questions.	A median score of <4 any item under construct A or item #9 under construct B for two consecutive years. The same negative sentiment theme appears in ≥10% of responses for two consecutive years.	A median score of 5 for any item under construct A or item #9 under construct B for two consecutive years. The same positive sentiment theme appears in ≥10% of responses for two consecutive years.

VII.B.4 Data Source #4: Preceptor Evaluation of Student Readiness to Enter the Profession

Survey Constructs (Concepts to Measure): C) Professionalism and Interpersonal Skills and D) Readiness for New Graduate Practice.

Rationale for Benchmarks: See #4 and #5 on Key Principles Guiding the Assessment Plan.

Sources for Triangulation of Data: Exit surveys and interviews, Professionalism rubrics from didactic courses and SCPEs, DEIAB survey, and as determined by DAC.

Data Source: Preceptor Evaluation of Readiness to Enter Profession Survey			
Benchmark for Quantitative Data	Benchmark for Qualitative Data	Identification of Areas in Need of Improvement	Identification of Areas of Strength
A median score of 4 for items under constructs C-D	The same theme is present in ≥10% responses to open-ended questions.	A median score <4 for any item under constructs C-D for two consecutive years. The same negative sentiment theme appears in ≥10% of responses for two consecutive years.	A median score of 5 for any item under constructs C-D for two consecutive years. The same positive sentiment theme appears in ≥10% of responses for two consecutive years.

VII.B.5. Data Source #5: Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, Access and Belonging (DEIAB) Survey

Survey Constructs (Concepts to Measure): A) Inclusion and Belonging and B) Program Policies and Curriculum.

Rationale for Benchmarks: See #4 and #5 on Key Principles Guiding the Assessment Plan.

Sources for Triangulation of Data: Exit surveys and interviews, Student Learning Environment survey, Culture and Environment constructs from course evaluations and evaluations of course instructors, and as determined by DAC.

Data Source: DEIAB Survey			
Benchmark for Quantitative Data	Benchmark for Qualitative Data	Identification of Areas in Need of Improvement	Identification of Areas of Strength
A median score of 4 for items under constructs A-B.	The same theme is present in $\geq 10\%$ responses to open-ended questions.	A median score < 4 for any item under constructs A-B for two consecutive years. The same negative sentiment theme appears in $\geq 10\%$ of responses for two consecutive years.	A median score of 5 for any item under constructs A-B, for two consecutive years. The same positive sentiment theme appears in $\geq 10\%$ of responses for two consecutive years.