DeAnza College **SLO ARCHIVE**

Student Learning Outcomes for HTEC 84A
Clinical Immunology/Immunohematology Lecture

Team Members:

Team Leader:
Debbie Wagner (8790) in HTEC

Other members:

1. Doris Spanggord (x8341) BIOL

Additional team members/notes about team:

Thuy Vo Pinheiro, Nayana Lowery

Additional Notes:

Outcomes:

Outcome 1 Phase I: Statement

Correlate clinical significance of serologic test results with possible disease states.

Outcome 1 Phase II: Assessment Strategy Used:

Assessment Quarter: Spring 2011
Assessors: Debbie Wagner
Assessment Tools: *No tools assigned*.
Sections being assessed: 01

Outcome 1 Phase III: Reflect & Enhance

Number of people involved in Phase III: 1

Changes:

Methods:
The midterm exam contained a case study in which students were given serologic laboratory test results and were asked to interpret those results and correlate those to a possible disease state. The final exam contained a similar case study in which students were given serologic laboratory test results and asked to interpret those results and

correlate those to a possible disease state.

Findings and Conclusions:
50% of the students were able to correctly interpret the test results and correlate those results to a possible disease state.When the midterm was handed back to the students, this question was reviewed in detail. The instructor welcomed questions regarding this case study.On the final examination question, 95% of the students were able to correctly interpret the test results and correlate them to a possible disease state.

Enhancement (Planned Actions)
Part I:
Instructor will re-assess this SLO on the final exam.On the final examination, 95% of the students were able to correctly interpret the test results and correlate them to a possible disease state.Instructor will continue to include case studies throughout the course to develop students critical thinking skills.

Part II:
no additional resources needed

Outcome 2 Phase I: Statement

Given patient history and various immunoheamatolgy testing evaluate the results and correalte them with various disease states.

Outcome 2 Phase II: Assessment Strategy Used:

Assessment Quarter: Spring 2011
Assessors: Debbie Wagner
Assessment Tools: *No tools assigned*.
Sections being assessed: 01

Outcome 2 Phase III: Reflect & Enhance

Number of people involved in Phase III: 1

Changes:

Methods:
Exams I and II each contained several questions in which the students were given patient history information and Immunohematology testing results and asked to correlate this information to possible disease statesThe final exam contained 11 questions in which students were given patient history information and Immunohematology testing results and asked to correlate this information to possible disease states

Findings and Conclusions:
Exam II, the students were given 4 of these types of questions. Average class score on 3 of these questions = 81%. The 4th question score was only 37%. Exam III, the students were given 8 of these types of questions. Average score = 82% A score of >80% indicates that the majority of students have met this SLO. The final exam will include additional questions

like these to continue access this SLO. It will also contain a question similar to the one on Exam II where only 37% of the class were successful in solving the problem presented.Student mean score on the 11 questions on the final examination = 85% By continually reviewing and working on case studies, students were able to improve their outcome on the final examination questions.This SLO was satisfactorily met by the majority of the students.

Enhancement (Planned Actions)
Part I:
Instructor will continue to present case studies as part of the curriculum throughout the course. This will enable students to develop the critical thinking skills needed in this profession.

Part II:
no additional resources needed.

SLO Created: 02/16/2010   Last Modified: 07/11/2011