

**Assurance of Student Learning Report  
2020-2021**

College of Health and Human

Public Health

Health Information Management- 529

Jan Hunt-Shepherd

*Use this page to list learning outcomes, measurements, and summarize results for your program. Detailed information must be completed in the subsequent pages.*

**Student Learning Outcome 1: Evaluate legal processes impacting health information/informatics**

**Instrument 1** Direct: Analysis of Electronic Health Record Professional Practice Experience (PPE)/Capstone Project

**Instrument 2** Direct: Creation of Policy and Procedure of Medical Record Documentation Requirements Assignment

**Instrument 3** Direct: Creation of an In-service Training program Assignment (analysis and utilization of laws)

Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.

Met

Not Met

**Student Learning Outcome 2: Apply organizational management processes**

**Instrument 1** Direct: Development of purchasing proposal and cost benefit analysis in Management Project in PPE/Capstone Project course

**Instrument 2** Direct: Recommendation of number of full-time equivalent workers needed in Management Project in PPE/Capstone Project course

**Instrument 3** Direct: Development of an organizational chart in the Management Project in PPE/Capstone Project course

Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.

Met

Not Met

**Student Learning Outcome 3: Recommend privacy/security strategies for health information**

**Instrument 1** Direct: Creation of Policy and Procedure for Patient Identity Management

**Instrument 2** Direct: Analysis of Electronic Health Record Professional Practice Experience (PPE)/Capstone Project

**Instrument 3** Direct: Creation of In-service Training program Assignment (privacy requirements training)

Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.

Met

Not Met

**Program Summary (Briefly summarize the action and follow up items from your detailed responses on subsequent pages.)**

Results from this assessment indicate that the learning outcomes were met for Student Learning Outcome 2 and 3, but not Learning Outcome 1. For Learning Outcome 1, two of the three measurements were met. During the 2019-2020 cycle Student Learning Outcome 1 was met in all categories but Student Learning Outcome 2 was not met in any of the three measurements (though they were in 2018-19 with no significant changes to curriculum or instructor). Changes to curriculum and rubrics did occur in 2019-2020 for Student Learning Outcome 2 and are now reflected in this current cycle. In the online leadership and management course there was an increased focus on all three instruments to achieve this learning outcome. Video tutorials and sample template examples were provided. Note: these measurement tools are just a small fraction of measurement tools within each of these assignments that measure the learning outcome. Due to the high volume of measurement tools not all are provided in this report.

## Student Learning Outcome 1

<b>Student Learning Outcome</b>	<b>Evaluate legal processes impacting health information/informatics:</b> Students should be able to achieve Bloom’s Taxonomic level 5 (Evaluation) related to evaluating the legal processes in health information/informatics to meet the competency level required by the program’s national accrediting body, CAHIIM (Commission on Accreditation of Health Informatics and Information Management Education) and to achieve a level of competence in this area to be able to successfully lead a Health Information Management department in a health care setting in meeting legal and regulatory requirements.		
<b>Measurement Instrument 1</b>	<b>Direct: Analysis of Electronic Health Record Professional Practice Experience (PPE)/Capstone Project</b> Students in the professional practice experience/capstone course (HIM 495) were given a final, written project that required them to analyze external/legal requirements related to the electronic health record to evaluate a health care facility’s compliance with the requirements. This measure aligns with the learning outcome by requiring the student to show competency in understanding, applying, and evaluating laws and regulations in health information/informatics. See attached rubric.		
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	Students should at the end of the project score either proficient or distinguished on the PPE/Capstone project rubric in this element.		
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	80% will receive proficient or distinguished in project element	<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	<b>77.8%</b> received proficient or distinguished in project element
<b>Methods</b>	(N=9 students) Written project submissions were graded based on PPE EHR Rubric. Students were expected to include evidence of accurate evaluation of accrediting, licensing, and/or certifying agency requirements to compare the facility’s electronic record system against those requirements. To meet this measure, the student must achieve a distinguished or proficient on the learning outcome. Results of measure are accessed by program director from Blackboard. 100% of the students are reported.		
<b>Measurement Instrument 2</b>	<b>Direct: Creation of Policy and Procedure of Medical Record Documentation Requirements Assignment;</b> Students should be able to achieve Bloom’s Taxonomic level 6 (Creation) by creating a policy and procedure (HIM 450) that shows ability to evaluate and apply the legal processes in health information/informatics in order to meet the competency level required by the program’s national accrediting body, CAHIIM (Commission on Accreditation of Health Informatics and Information Management Education) and to achieve a level of competence in this element to be able to successfully lead a Health Information Management department in a health care setting in meeting legal and regulatory requirements. See attached rubric.		
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	Students should at the end of the written assignment score within the distinguished or proficient range at least 70% of the time for timeliness and content of the History and Physical and Operative Report sections assessed on the Policy and Procedure Creation on Documentation Assignment.		
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	80% will receive proficient or distinguished in project element	<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	<b>100%</b> received proficient or distinguished in project element

<b>Methods</b>	(N=8 students) Written project submissions were graded based on P&P Creation for Documentation Requirements Grading Sheet for sections for timeliness and content of the History and Physical and Operative Report. Students were expected to review regulations and laws for content of medical records to develop an appropriate policy and procedure. Grades were assigned based on student accuracy within identified sections. Results of measure are accessed by program director from Blackboard. 100% of the students are reported.		
<b>Measurement Instrument 3</b>	<b>Direct measure of student learning: Students in Leadership and Management in Health Information course (HIM 421) were given an assignment to develop an in-service training presentation.</b> This measure aligns with the learning outcome by requiring the student to show competency in analysis and utilization of laws to successfully lead a health information management department. See attached rubric.		
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	Students should at the end of the assignment successfully develop an in-service training presentation that demonstrates analysis and utilization of laws and regulations pertaining to privacy, security, and confidentiality on the assignment for creating an in-service training presentation. To meet this measure, the student must achieve a distinguished or proficient on the analysis and utilization of laws element.		
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	80% will receive proficient or distinguished in project element	<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	<b>89%</b> received proficient or distinguished in project element
<b>Methods</b>	(N=9 students) Written project submissions were graded based on Rubric for section on analysis and utilization of laws and regulations in the assignment for creating an In-service training presentation. Students were expected to review regulations and laws for content of medical records to develop an appropriate policy and procedure. Grades were assigned based on student accuracy within identified sections. Results of measure are accessed by program director from Blackboard. 100% of the students are reported.		
<b>Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Met</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Not Met</b>
<b>Actions:</b> Core course and program outcomes were examined in relation to the Student Learning Outcome 1. Measurement Instrument 1 and 2: Since one of the best practices for learning is to allow students to provide a draft copy for assessment and then provide a revision, this option was given to the students. For the first measure all students provided drafts for assessment, but two students did not follow directions provided on feedback of drafts. A copy of the measurement tools is attached. In the 2019-2020 SLO program report, the program determined that an additional measurement for this Student Learning Outcome 1 would be added, therefore Measurement Instrument 3 was added for 2020-2021.			
<b>Follow-Up</b>			
The current learning outcome and measurement instruments are appropriate for continuation due to national accrediting regulations. No changes are planned at this time.			
<b>Next Assessment Cycle Plan</b> (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome)			
This outcome will be assessed at the end of each academic year. Faculty will provide program director access to Blackboard courses for collecting and providing data and information. Data on all students participating in HIM 495 (Professional Practice Experience/Capstone), HIM 221 (Leadership and Management in HIM) and HIM 450 (Application and Analysis in Health Information Management) will be evaluated.			

### Student Learning Outcome 2

<b>Student Learning Outcome</b>	Apply organizational management processes: : Students should be able to achieve Bloom's Taxonomic level 3 (Application) related to applying organizational management processes in order to meet the competency level required by the program's national accrediting body, CAHIIM (Commission on Accreditation of Health Informatics and Information Management Education) and to achieve a level of competence in this element to be able to successfully lead a Health Information Management department in a health care setting.
---------------------------------	--

<b>Measurement Instrument 1</b>	<b>Direct measure of student learning: Development of purchasing proposal and cost benefit analysis in Management Project in PPE/Capstone Project course.</b> This measure aligns with the learning outcome by requiring the student to show competency in understanding and applying organizational management processes. See attached rubric.			
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	Students should at the end of the project score either proficient or distinguished on the Management project rubric in this element. To meet this measure, the student must achieve a distinguished or proficient on the learning outcome.			
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	80% will receive proficient or distinguished in project element	<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	100% received proficient or distinguished in project element	
<b>Methods</b>	(N=7 students) Written project submissions were graded based on PPE/Capstone Management Project Rubric in this element. Students were expected to submit appropriate purchasing proposal and cost benefit analysis. Results of measure are accessed by program director from Blackboard. 100% of the students completing that section are reported.			
<b>Measurement Instrument 2</b>	<b>Direct measure of student learning: Recommend number of full-time equivalent workers needed for in Management Project in PPE/Capstone Project course.</b> This measure aligns with the learning outcome by requiring the student to show competency in understanding and applying organizational management processes. See attached rubric.			
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	Students should at the end of the project score either proficient or distinguished on the Management project rubric in this element.			
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	80% will receive proficient or distinguished in project element	<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	87.5% received proficient or distinguished in project element	
<b>Methods</b>	(N=8 students) Written project submissions were graded based on PPE/Capstone Management Project Rubric in this element. Students were expected to submit appropriate recommendations for full-time equivalent workers for the project. Results of measure are accessed by program director from Blackboard. 100% of the students are reported.			
<b>Measurement Instrument 3</b>	<b>Direct measure of student learning: Development of an organizational chart in the Management Project in PPE/Capstone Project course.</b> This measure aligns with the learning outcome by requiring the student to show competency in understanding and applying organizational management processes. See attached rubric.			
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	Students should at the end of the project score either proficient or distinguished on the Management project rubric in this element.			
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	80% will receive proficient or distinguished in project element	<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	100% received proficient or distinguished in project element	
<b>Methods</b>	(N=7 students) Written project submissions were graded based on PPE/Capstone Management Project Rubric in this element. Students were expected to develop an appropriate organizational chart for the project. Results of measure are accessed by program director from Blackboard. 100% of the students completing that section are reported.			
<b>Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.</b>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Met</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Not Met</b>
<b>Actions</b> (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)				

Prior to the 2020-2021 cycle, in the online leadership and management course there was an increased focus on all three instruments to achieve this learning outcome. Video tutorials and sample template examples were provided. This learning outcome was met in 2018-20 but not in 2019-20 which is why content delivery was changed. No significant changes are planned for 2021-2022 since measures were met in this cycle. Note: these measurement tools are just a small fraction of measurement tools within each of these assignments that measure the learning outcome.

**Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)

By providing additional content delivery, students were able to better understand concepts and apply them in practice resulting in all three measurement instruments being met this cycle.

**Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome)

This outcome will be assessed at the end of each academic year. Faculty will provide program director access to Blackboard courses for collecting and providing data and information. Data on all students participating in HIM 495 (Professional Practice Experience/Capstone, HIM 450 (Application and Analysis in Health Information Management), and HIM 421 (Leadership and Management in Health Information) will be evaluated.

### Student Learning Outcome 3

<b>Student Learning Outcome</b>	<b>Recommend privacy/security strategies for health information;</b> Students should be able to achieve Bloom’s Taxonomic level 5 (Evaluation) related to evaluating the legal processes in health information/informatics to meet the competency level required by the program’s national accrediting body, CAHIIM (Commission on Accreditation of Health Informatics and Information Management Education) and to achieve a level of competence in this element to be able to successfully lead a Health Information Management department in a health care setting in meeting privacy and security requirements.		
<b>Measurement Instrument 1</b>	<b>Direct measure of student learning: Students in Application and Analysis of Health Information Management course (HIM 450) were given a project to create a policy and procedure for patient identity management.</b> This measure aligns with the learning outcome by requiring the student to show competency in understanding and applying privacy and security strategies to successfully lead a health information management department. See attached rubric.		
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	Students should at the end of the project successfully develop an identification method for patients being admitted to the hospital. To meet this measure, the student must achieve a distinguished or proficient on the learning outcome.		
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	80% will receive proficient or distinguished in project element	<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	<b>85.7%</b> received proficient or distinguished in project element
<b>Methods</b>	(N= 7 students) Written project submissions were graded based on “Create a Policy and Procedure for Patient Identity Management” rubric to include evidence of a policy and procedure for appropriately identifying patients at the time of admission to the hospital. To meet this measure, the student must achieve a distinguished or proficient on the learning outcome. Results of measure are accessed by program director from Blackboard. 100% of the students are reported.		

<b>Measurement Instrument 2</b>	<b>Direct measure of student learning outcome: Students in the professional practice experience/capstone course (HIM 495) were given a final, written project that required them to evaluate information use, privacy, and security of health information in a health care facility.</b> This measure aligns with the learning outcome by requiring the student to show competency in understanding and applying information use, privacy, and security strategies to successfully lead a health information management department. See attached rubric.		
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	Students should at the end of the project score either proficient or distinguished on the PPE/Capstone project rubric in this element.		
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	80% will receive proficient or distinguished in project element	<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	<b>88.8%</b> received proficient or distinguished in project element
<b>Methods</b>	(N=9 students) Written project submissions were graded based on PPE EHR Rubric. Students were expected to include evidence of appropriate evaluation of the information use, privacy, and security of health information in a health care facility. Results of measure are accessed by program director from Blackboard. 100% of the students are reported.		
<b>Measurement Instrument 3</b>	<b>Direct measure of student learning: Students in Leadership and Management in Health Information course (HIM 421) were given an assignment to develop an in-service training presentation.</b> One element of the assignment is privacy protection. This measure aligns with the learning outcome by requiring the student to show competency in developing training presentation for employees which includes privacy requirements to successfully lead a health information management department. See attached rubric.		
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	Students should at the end of the assignment successfully develop an in-service training presentation that includes mechanism for protecting patient information privacy. To meet this measure, the student must achieve a distinguished or proficient on the privacy protection requirements element.		
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	80%	<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	<b>100%</b> received proficient or distinguished in project element
<b>Methods</b>	(N= 9 students) Written project submissions were graded based on the “Development of In-service Training Presentation for Privacy, Security, and Confidentiality Assignment” rubric. Students were expected to include evidence of appropriate privacy protection requirements for employees within the presentation. Student must achieve a distinguished or proficient on the element. Results of measure are accessed by program director from Blackboard. 100% of the students are reported.		
<b>Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.</b>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Met</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Not Met</b>
<b>Actions</b> (Describe the decision-making process and actions for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)			
For Student Learning Outcome Measurement Instrument 3 in 2018-2019 results were 100%, decreased to 75% last year and increased back to 100% this year. No significant changes occurred between the last two cycles.			
<b>Follow-Up</b> (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)			
The current learning outcome and measurement instruments are appropriate for continuation due to national accrediting regulations.			
<b>Next Assessment Cycle Plan</b> (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome)			
This outcome will be assessed at the end of each academic year. Faculty will provide program director access to Blackboard courses for collecting and providing data and information. Data on all students participating in HIM 495 (Professional Practice Experience/Capstone, HIM 450 (Application and Analysis in Health Information Management), and HIM 421 (Leadership and Management in Health Information) will be evaluated.			

Name: Analysis of EHR - PPE/Capstone Project Rubric

Description: **This rubric is designed to assess (grade) the EHR Project report. The content of the report should address all criteria listed.**

**The student is considered competent in the criteria item by receiving a proficient or distinguished ranking.**

	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Novice</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<p>Points Range: 8.5 (8.50% - 10 (10.00%))</p> <p>The introduction is inviting, state the main topic and objectives and previews the structure/methodology of the project</p>	<p>Points Range: 7 (7.00%) - 8.4 (8.40%)</p> <p>The introduction clearly states the main topic and objectives and previews the structure/methodology of the project, but it is not particularly inviting to the reader.</p>	<p>Points Range: 6 (6.00%) - 6.9 (6.90%)</p> <p>The introduction states the main topic and objectives but does not adequately preview the structure/methodology of the project nor is it particularly inviting to the reader.</p>	<p>Points Range: 0 (0.00%) - 5.9 (5.90%)</p> <p>There is no clear introduction of the main topic or objectives. Nor is the structure/methodology addressed in the project.</p>
<b>Organization of report</b>	<p>Points Range: 8.5 (8.50% - 10 (10.00%))</p> <p>Details are placed in a logical order and the way they are presented effectively keeps the interest of the reader.</p>	<p>Points Range: 7 (7.00%) - 8.4 (8.40%)</p> <p>Details are placed in a logical order, but the way they are presented sometimes makes the writing less interesting.</p>	<p>Points Range: 6 (6.00%) - 6.9 (6.90%)</p> <p>Some details are not in a logical or expected order and this distracts the reader.</p>	<p>Points Range: 0 (0.00%) - 5.9 (5.90%)</p> <p>Many details are not in a logical or expected order. There is little sense that the project is organized</p>

	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Novice</b>
<b>Grammar and Spelling</b>	<p>Points Range: 1.7 (1.70%) - 2 (2.00%)</p> <p>There are no spelling or grammatical errors in the project. Sentences are clear.</p>	<p>Points Range: 1.4 (1.40%) - 1.68 (1.68%)</p> <p>There are one to two spelling errors or grammatical errors in the project. One or two sentences may be awkward or difficult to understand.</p>	<p>Points Range: 1.2 (1.20%) - 1.38 (1.38%)</p> <p>There are 3-5 spelling or grammatical errors. Three to five sentences may be awkward or difficult to understand</p>	<p>Points Range: 0 (0.00%) - 1.18 (1.18%)</p> <p>There are six or more spelling or grammatical errors. There are six or more sentences that may be awkward or difficult to understand.</p>
<b>External/Legal</b>	<p>Points Range: 5.95 (5.95%) - 7 (7.00%)</p> <p>After Evaluation, provides recommendations and commendations that are well thought out, reasonable, logical, and concise</p>	<p>Points Range: 4.9 (4.90%) - 5.88 (5.88%)</p> <p>Evaluates External/Legal standards and guidelines in relationship to facility</p>	<p>Points Range: 4.2 (4.20%) - 4.83 (4.83%)</p> <p>Identifies External/Legal standards in relationship to facility</p>	<p>Points Range: 0 (0.00%) - 4.13 (4.13%)</p> <p>No clear evidence that external/legal standards were addressed in report</p>
<b>Information Governance</b>	<p>Points Range: 5.1 (5.10%) - 6 (6.00%)</p> <p>After Evaluation, provides recommendations and commendations that are well thought out,</p>	<p>Points Range: 4.2 (4.20%) - 5.04 (5.04%)</p> <p>Evaluates Information Governance documents/activities at facility</p>	<p>Points Range: 3.6 (3.60%) - 4.14 (4.14%)</p> <p>Identifies Information Governance at facility (Strategic Planning, development, P&amp;Ps,</p>	<p>Points Range: 0 (0.00%) - 3.54 (3.54%)</p> <p>No clear evidence that Information Governance is addressed in report</p>



	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Novice</b>
	reasonable, logical, and concise		project management activities)	
<b>Life Cycle</b>	<p>Points Range: 5.1 (5.10%) - 6 (6.00%)</p> <p>After Evaluation, provides recommendations and commendations that are well thought out, reasonable, logical, and concise</p>	<p>Points Range: 4.2 (4.20%) - 5.04 (5.04%)</p> <p>Evaluates EHR Life Cycle documents/activities at facility</p>	<p>Points Range: 3.6 (3.60%) - 4.14 (4.14%)</p> <p>Identifies EHR Life Cycle at facility</p>	<p>Points Range: 0 (0.00%) - 3.54 (3.54%)</p> <p>No clear evidence that EHR Life Cycle is addressed in report</p>
<b>EHR Infrastructure</b>	<p>Points Range: 10.2 (10.20%) - 12 (12.00%)</p> <p>After Evaluation, provides recommendations and commendations that are well thought out, reasonable, logical, and concise</p>	<p>Points Range: 8.4 (8.40%) - 10.08 (10.08%)</p> <p>Evaluates EHR Infrastructure at facility</p>	<p>Points Range: 7.2 (7.20%) - 8.28 (8.28%)</p> <p>Identifies components of Infrastructure at facility</p>	<p>Points Range: 0 (0.00%) - 7.08 (7.08%)</p> <p>No clear evidence that EHR Infrastructure is addressed in report</p>
<b>Privacy and Security</b>	<p>Points Range: 6.8 (6.80%) - 8 (8.00%)</p> <p>After Evaluation, provides recommendations and</p>	<p>Points Range: 5.6 (5.60%) - 6.72 (6.72%)</p>	<p>Points Range: 4.8 (4.80%) - 5.52 (5.52%)</p>	<p>Points Range: 0 (0.00%) - 4.72 (4.72%)</p> <p>No clear evidence that Privacy and Security</p>

	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Novice</b>
	commendations that are well thought out, reasonable, logical, and concise	Evaluates Privacy and Security measures at facility	Identifies Privacy and Security measures at facility	measures are addressed in report
<b>Data Integrity</b>	<p>Points Range: 6.8 (6.80%) - 8 (8.00%)</p> <p>After Evaluation, provides recommendations and commendations that are well thought out, reasonable, logical, and concise</p>	<p>Points Range: 5.6 (5.60%) - 6.72 (6.72%)</p> <p>Evaluates Data Integrity at facility</p>	<p>Points Range: 4.8 (4.80%) - 5.52 (5.52%)</p> <p>Identifies Data Integrity measures at facility</p>	<p>Points Range: 0 (0.00%) - 4.72 (4.72%)</p> <p>No clear evidence that Data Integrity is addressed in report</p>
<b>Information Use</b>	<p>Points Range: 5.95 (5.95%) - 7 (7.00%)</p> <p>After Evaluation, provides recommendations and commendations that are well thought out, reasonable, logical, and concise</p>	<p>Points Range: 4.9 (4.90%) - 5.88 (5.88%)</p> <p>Evaluates activities/documentation of components of Information Use at facility</p>	<p>Points Range: 4.2 (4.20%) - 4.83 (4.83%)</p> <p>Identifies activities/documentation of components of Information Use</p>	<p>Points Range: 0 (0.00%) - 4.13 (4.13%)</p> <p>No clear evidence that Information Use is addressed in report</p>

	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Novice</b>
<b>Clinical &amp; Administrative Decision Support and other Specialty Software</b>	<p>Points Range: 5.1 (5.10%) - 6 (6.00%)</p> <p>After Evaluation, provides recommendations and commendations that are well thought out, reasonable, logical, and concise</p>	<p>Points Range: 4.2 (4.20%) - 5.04 (5.04%)</p> <p>Evaluates Clinical &amp; Admin Decision Support and other specialty software utilized at facility</p>	<p>Points Range: 3.6 (3.60%) - 4.14 (4.14%)</p> <p>Identifies Clinical &amp; Admin Decision Support and other specialty software utilized at facility</p>	<p>Points Range: 0 (0.00%) - 3.54 (3.54%)</p> <p>No clear evidence that Clinical &amp; Admin Decision Support and other specialty software is addressed in report</p>
<b>Planning and Organizational Development</b>	<p>Points Range: 5.1 (5.10%) - 6 (6.00%)</p> <p>After Evaluation, provides recommendations and commendations that are well thought out, reasonable, logical, and concise</p>	<p>Points Range: 4.2 (4.20%) - 5.04 (5.04%)</p> <p>Evaluates Organizational Development: activities at facility</p>	<p>Points Range: 3.6 (3.60%) - 4.14 (4.14%)</p> <p>Identifies Organizational Development: items</p>	<p>Points Range: 0 (0.00%) - 3.54 (3.54%)</p> <p>No clear evidence that Organizational Development items are addressed in report</p>
<b>Current and Future Plans at facility and Lessons Learned</b>	<p>Points Range: 5.95 (5.95%) - 7 (7.00%)</p> <p>After Evaluation, provides recommendations and commendations that are well thought out,</p>	<p>Points Range: 4.9 (4.90%) - 5.88 (5.88%)</p> <p>Evaluates current and future plans of EHR at facility</p>	<p>Points Range: 4.2 (4.20%) - 4.83 (4.83%)</p> <p>Identifies current and future plans of EHR at facility</p>	<p>Points Range: 0 (0.00%) - 4.13 (4.13%)</p> <p>No clear evidence that current and future plans at facility related to EHR is addressed in report</p>

	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Novice</b>
	reasonable, logical, and concise			
<b>Conclusion- Final/Summary Recommendations and Commendations</b>	<p>Points Range: 4.25 (4.25%) - 5 (5.00%)</p> <p>Final/summary recommendations and commendations are well thought out, reasonable, logical, and concise</p>	<p>Points Range: 3.5 (3.50%) - 4.2 (4.20%)</p> <p>Final/summary recommendations and commendations are sufficient, but could be better presented</p>	<p>Points Range: 3 (3.00%) - 3.45 (3.45%)</p> <p>Final/summary recommendations and commendations exist, but are inappropriate, unreasonable, or not logical.</p>	<p>Points Range: 0 (0.00%) - 2.95 (2.95%)</p> <p>No final/summary recommendations or commendations present in report</p>

Name: **Creation of Policy and Procedure for Documentation Requirements Assignment Rubric**

Description: **Novice- work is below standard the student should reach Apprentice- work is closer to standard but still not strong enough- Proficient- work meets standard Distinguished- work is above standard**

	<b>Distinguished (100% of points)</b>	<b>Proficient (75% of points)</b>	<b>Apprentice (50% of points)</b>	<b>Novice (0% of points)</b>
<b>Analyze and utilized laws and regulations pertaining to clinical documentation requirements.</b>	Points: <b>2</b> (4.00%) Analyzed laws and used them appropriately.	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) Identified laws, but did not fully integrate into P&P	Points: <b>1</b> (2.00%) Identified one law related to issue, but used inappropriately	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) No clear evidence that laws were analyzed.
<b>Determine which departments/individuals would be involved in the patient documentation process as it pertains to H&amp;P, Discharge Summary, and Operative Report.</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) Appropriate departments/ individuals were identified	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) More than one department/ individual was identified, but missing some	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) One department/ individual was identified	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) No clear evidence that departments were identified
<b>P &amp; P Format (includes Policy, Purpose, Procedures)</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) P&P format is well-designed, appropriate, and logical.	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) P&P format is good, but requires additional "tweaking"	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) P&P format has been created, but only partially meets needs.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) There is no P&P or a poorly designed one.
<b>Organization</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%)	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%)	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%)	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%)

	<b>Distinguished (100% of points)</b>	<b>Proficient (75% of points)</b>	<b>Apprentice (50% of points)</b>	<b>Novice (0% of points)</b>
	Information is presented in a logical sequence which flows naturally.	Information is presented in a logical sequence which is followed by the reader with little or no difficulty.	Information is presented in an order that the audience can follow with minimum difficulty.	Information and ideas are not organized or they are poorly sequenced (the author jumps around). The audience has difficulty following the thread of thought.
<b>Professional (including grammar and spelling)</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) There are no misspelled words or grammatical errors in the document.	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) There are one or two misspellings and/or grammatical errors	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) There are three or five misspellings and/or grammatical errors	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) There are more than five misspellings and/or grammatical errors
<b>P&amp;P addresses when a history and physical is required</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and shows evidence of strong understanding of the topic.	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and reasonably complete, but could be improved.	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) Category is addressed, but is incomplete.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) Category is not addressed or is inaccurate.

	<b>Distinguished (100% of points)</b>	<b>Proficient (75% of points)</b>	<b>Apprentice (50% of points)</b>	<b>Novice (0% of points)</b>
<b>P&amp;P addresses timeliness of history and physical</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) Category is addressed, appropriate, complete, and shows evidence of strong understanding of the topic.	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and most of the elements (reasonably complete), but could be improved.	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) Category is addressed, but is incomplete.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) Category is not addressed or is inaccurate.
<b>P&amp;P addresses content of the history and physical</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and shows evidence of strong understanding of the topic.	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and reasonably complete, but could be improved.	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) Category is addressed, but is incomplete.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) Category is not addressed or is inaccurate.
<b>P&amp;P addresses who is allowed to author the history and physical.</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and shows evidence of strong	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and reasonably	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) Category is addressed, but is incomplete.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) Category is not addressed or is inaccurate.

	<b>Distinguished (100% of points)</b>	<b>Proficient (75% of points)</b>	<b>Apprentice (50% of points)</b>	<b>Novice (0% of points)</b>
	understanding of the topic.	complete, but could be improved.		
<b>P&amp;P addresses when a Discharge Summary is required</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and shows evidence of strong understanding of the topic.	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and reasonably complete, but could be improved.	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) Category is addressed, but is incomplete.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) Category is not addressed or is inaccurate.
<b>P&amp;P addresses timeliness of Discharge Summary</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and shows evidence of strong understanding of the topic.	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and reasonably complete, but could be improved.	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) Category is addressed, but is incomplete.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) Category is not addressed or is inaccurate.
<b>P&amp;P addresses content of the Discharge Summary</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) Category is addressed, but is incomplete.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) Category is not addressed or is inaccurate.



	<b>Distinguished (100% of points)</b>	<b>Proficient (75% of points)</b>	<b>Apprentice (50% of points)</b>	<b>Novice (0% of points)</b>
	shows evidence of strong understanding of the topic.	reasonably complete, but could be improved.		
<b>P&amp;P addresses who is allowed to author the Discharge Summary.</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and shows evidence of strong understanding of the topic.	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and reasonably complete, but could be improved.	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) Category is addressed, but is incomplete.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) Category is not addressed or is inaccurate.
<b>P&amp;P addresses when an Operative Report is required</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and shows evidence of strong understanding of the topic.	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and reasonably complete, but could be improved.	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) Category is addressed, but is incomplete.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) Category is not addressed or is inaccurate.
<b>P&amp;P addresses timeliness of Operative Report</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%)	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%)	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%)	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%)

	<b>Distinguished (100% of points)</b>	<b>Proficient (75% of points)</b>	<b>Apprentice (50% of points)</b>	<b>Novice (0% of points)</b>
	Category is addressed, appropriate, and shows evidence of strong understanding of the topic.	Category is addressed, appropriate, and reasonably complete, but could be improved.	Category is addressed, but is incomplete.	Category is not addressed or is inaccurate.
<b>P&amp;P addresses content of the Operative Report</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and shows evidence of strong understanding of the topic.	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and reasonably complete, but could be improved.	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) Category is addressed, but is incomplete.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) Category is not addressed or is inaccurate.
<b>P&amp;P addresses who is allowed to author Operative Report.</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and shows evidence of strong understanding of the topic.	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) Case study is generally accurate and reasonably complete, but could be improved.	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) Case Study is addressed and sometimes inaccurate or incomplete	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) Case Study is not addressed or is inaccurate.

Name: **Creation of In-service Training Presentation for Privacy, Security, and Confidentiality Assignment Rubric**  
 Description: **Novice- work is below standard the student should reach Apprentice- work is closer to standard but still not strong enough Proficient- work meets standard Distinguished- work is above standard**

	<b>Distinguished (100% of points)</b>	<b>Proficient (75% of points)</b>	<b>Apprentice (50% of points)</b>	<b>Novice (0% of points)</b>
<b>Analyze and utilize laws and regulations (HIPAA, ARRA, HITECH) pertaining to privacy, security, and confidentiality.</b>	Points: <b>5</b> (10.00%) Analyzed referenced laws and used them appropriately.	Points: <b>3.75</b> (7.50%) Identified and defined all referenced laws, but did not fully integrate into presentation	Points: <b>2.5</b> (5.00%) Identified and defined some, but not all, laws related to issue and/or used inappropriately or did not reference laws throughout presentation	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) No clear evidence that laws were analyzed in creating presentation
<b>Presentation Length</b>	Points: <b>5</b> (10.00%) Presentation is of length to include all basic and advanced information in order for employees to get best training on topic.	Points: <b>3.75</b> (7.50%) Presentation is of length to include all basic pertinent information in order for employees to complete work at an acceptable level. (Minimum 16 slides)	Points: <b>2.5</b> (5.00%) Presentation is of length that provided some basic pertinent information in order for employees to partially work at an acceptable level, but some pertinent information was missed.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) No clear evidence that employees were provided with sufficient information to apply to their jobs.

	<b>Distinguished (100% of points)</b>	<b>Proficient (75% of points)</b>	<b>Apprentice (50% of points)</b>	<b>Novice (0% of points)</b>
<b>Format</b>	<p>Points: <b>5</b> (10.00%)</p> <p>Format is well-designed, appropriate, and aesthetically pleasing.</p>	<p>Points: <b>3.75</b> (7.50%)</p> <p>Format is good, but requires additional "tweaking".</p>	<p>Points: <b>2.5</b> (5.00%)</p> <p>Format has been created, but only partially meets needs.</p>	<p>Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%)</p> <p>There is no consistent formatting or a poorly designed one.</p>
<b>Organization</b>	<p>Points: <b>5</b> (10.00%)</p> <p>Information is presented in a logical sequence which flows naturally.</p>	<p>Points: <b>3.75</b> (7.50%)</p> <p>Information is presented in a logical sequence which is followed by the reader with little or no difficulty.</p>	<p>Points: <b>2.5</b> (5.00%)</p> <p>Information is presented in an order that the audience can follow with minimum difficulty.</p>	<p>Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%)</p> <p>Information and ideas are not organized or they are poorly sequenced (the author jumps around). The audience has difficulty following the thread of thought.</p>
<b>Professional (including grammar and spelling)</b>	<p>Points: <b>5</b> (10.00%)</p> <p>There are no misspelled words or grammatical errors in the document.</p>	<p>Points: <b>3.75</b> (7.50%)</p> <p>There are one or two misspellings and/or grammatical errors</p>	<p>Points: <b>2.5</b> (5.00%)</p> <p>There are three or five misspellings and/or grammatical errors</p>	<p>Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%)</p> <p>There are more than five misspellings and/or systematic grammatical errors</p>

	<b>Distinguished (100% of points)</b>	<b>Proficient (75% of points)</b>	<b>Apprentice (50% of points)</b>	<b>Novice (0% of points)</b>
<b>Presentation addresses privacy requirements for employees</b>	Points: <b>5</b> (10.00%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and shows evidence of strong understanding of the topic.	Points: <b>3.75</b> (7.50%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and reasonably complete, but could be improved.	Points: <b>2.5</b> (5.00%) Category is addressed, but is incomplete.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) Category is not addressed or is inaccurate.
<b>Presentation addresses security requirements for employees</b>	Points: <b>5</b> (10.00%) Category is addressed, appropriate, complete, and shows evidence of strong understanding of the topic.	Points: <b>3.75</b> (7.50%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and most of the elements (reasonably complete), but could be improved.	Points: <b>2.5</b> (5.00%) Category is addressed, but is incomplete.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) Category is not addressed or is inaccurate.
<b>Presentation addresses confidentiality requirements for employees</b>	Points: <b>5</b> (10.00%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and shows evidence of strong	Points: <b>3.75</b> (7.50%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and reasonably complete, but could be improved.	Points: <b>2.5</b> (5.00%) Category is addressed, but is incomplete.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) Category is not addressed or is inaccurate.

	<b>Distinguished (100% of points)</b>	<b>Proficient (75% of points)</b>	<b>Apprentice (50% of points)</b>	<b>Novice (0% of points)</b>
	understanding of the topic.			
<b>Presentation addresses best practices that employees must adhere to.</b>	Points: <b>5</b> (10.00%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and shows evidence of strong understanding of the topic.	Points: <b>3.75</b> (7.50%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and reasonably complete, but could be improved.	Points: <b>2.5</b> (5.00%) Category is addressed, but is incomplete.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) Category is not addressed or is inaccurate.
<b>Presentation includes ten post-test questions for employees.</b>	Points: <b>5</b> (10.00%) There was a minimum of ten post-test questions, all of which were appropriate and had answers that were found within presentation.	Points: <b>3.75</b> (7.50%) There was a minimum of ten post-test questions, but some of the questions could be improved.	Points: <b>2.5</b> (5.00%) Minimum number of post-test questions was not met, most questions were inappropriate, or answers were not found within the presentation.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) Category is not addressed or is inaccurate.

Name: **Management Project Rubric**

Description: **This rubric is designed to assess (grade) the Management Project Report. The content of the report should address all criteria listed.**

**The student is considered competent in the criteria item by receiving a proficient or distinguished ranking.**

	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Novice</b>
<b>Title Page</b>	Points: <b>1</b> (1.00%) Title page is professionally provided.	Points: <b>0.8</b> (0.80%) Title page is professionally provided with minor revisions.	Points: <b>0.5</b> (0.50%) Title page is unprofessionally provided; a title page is provided.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) No title page.
<b>Mission Statement/Goals</b>	Points: <b>2</b> (2.00%) Two clear HIM Department mission statements and/or goals provided.	Points: <b>1</b> (1.00%) One clear HIM Department mission statement and/or goal provided.	Points: <b>0.5</b> (0.50%) No HIM Department mission statement and/or goals; unclear HIM Department mission statements and/or goals.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) No HIM Department mission statement and/or goals; unclear HIM Department mission statements and/or goals
<b>Department Functions</b>	Points: <b>10</b> (10.00%)	Points: <b>8</b> (8.00%)	Points: <b>4</b> (4.00%)	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%)
<b>Job Position Titles and Personnel Duties</b>	Points: <b>10</b> (10.00%)	Points: <b>8</b> (8.00%)	Points: <b>4</b> (4.00%)	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%)
<b>Number of FTEs</b>	Points:	Points:	Points:	Points:

	<b>Distinguished</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Apprentice</b>	<b>Novice</b>
	<b>10</b> (10.00%)	<b>8</b> (8.00%)	<b>4</b> (4.00%)	<b>0</b> (0.00%)
<b>Labor Trends/Market Analysis, Benchmarking, Performance Standards for coder and a Cost-Benefit Analysis for outsourcing coding or completing in-house</b>	Points: <b>15</b> (15.00%)	Points: <b>13</b> (13.00%)	Points: <b>6</b> (6.00%)	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%)
<b>Work Schedule</b>	Points: <b>10</b> (10.00%)	Points: <b>8</b> (8.00%)	Points: <b>4</b> (4.00%)	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%)
<b>Organization Chart</b>	Points: <b>10</b> (10.00%)	Points: <b>8</b> (8.00%)	Points: <b>4</b> (4.00%)	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%)
<b>Purchasing Proposal and Cost Benefit Analysis</b>	Points: <b>7</b> (7.00%)	Points: <b>5</b> (5.00%)	Points: <b>3</b> (3.00%)	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%)
<b>Flow Process Chart</b>	Points: <b>15</b> (15.00%)	Points: <b>13</b> (13.00%)	Points: <b>6</b> (6.00%)	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%)
<b>Professional Development Plan</b>	Points: <b>10</b> (10.00%)	Points: <b>8</b> (8.00%)	Points: <b>4</b> (4.00%)	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%)



Name: **Creation of Policy and Procedure for Documentation Requirements Assignment Rubric**

Description: **Novice- work is below standard the student should reach Apprentice- work is closer to standard but still not strong enough- Proficient- work meets standard Distinguished- work is above standard**

	<b>Distinguished (100% of points)</b>	<b>Proficient (75% of points)</b>	<b>Apprentice (50% of points)</b>	<b>Novice (0% of points)</b>
<b>Analyze and utilized laws and regulations pertaining to clinical documentation requirements.</b>	Points: <b>2</b> (4.00%) Analyzed laws and used them appropriately.	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) Identified laws, but did not fully integrate into P&P	Points: <b>1</b> (2.00%) Identified one law related to issue, but used inappropriately	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) No clear evidence that laws were analyzed.
<b>Determine which departments/individuals would be involved in the patient documentation process as it pertains to H&amp;P, Discharge Summary, and Operative Report.</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) Appropriate departments/ individuals were identified	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) More than one department/ individual was identified, but missing some	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) One department/ individual was identified	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) No clear evidence that departments were identified
<b>P &amp; P Format (includes Policy, Purpose, Procedures)</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) P&P format is well-designed, appropriate, and logical.	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) P&P format is good, but requires additional "tweaking"	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) P&P format has been created, but only partially meets needs.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) There is no P&P or a poorly designed one.
<b>Organization</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%)	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%)	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%)	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%)

	<b>Distinguished (100% of points)</b>	<b>Proficient (75% of points)</b>	<b>Apprentice (50% of points)</b>	<b>Novice (0% of points)</b>
	Information is presented in a logical sequence which flows naturally.	Information is presented in a logical sequence which is followed by the reader with little or no difficulty.	Information is presented in an order that the audience can follow with minimum difficulty.	Information and ideas are not organized or they are poorly sequenced (the author jumps around). The audience has difficulty following the thread of thought.
<b>Professional (including grammar and spelling)</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) There are no misspelled words or grammatical errors in the document.	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) There are one or two misspellings and/or grammatical errors	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) There are three or five misspellings and/or grammatical errors	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) There are more than five misspellings and/or grammatical errors
<b>P&amp;P addresses when a history and physical is required</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and shows evidence of strong understanding of the topic.	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and reasonably complete, but could be improved.	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) Category is addressed, but is incomplete.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) Category is not addressed or is inaccurate.

	<b>Distinguished (100% of points)</b>	<b>Proficient (75% of points)</b>	<b>Apprentice (50% of points)</b>	<b>Novice (0% of points)</b>
<b>P&amp;P addresses timeliness of history and physical</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) Category is addressed, appropriate, complete, and shows evidence of strong understanding of the topic.	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and most of the elements (reasonably complete), but could be improved.	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) Category is addressed, but is incomplete.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) Category is not addressed or is inaccurate.
<b>P&amp;P addresses content of the history and physical</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and shows evidence of strong understanding of the topic.	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and reasonably complete, but could be improved.	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) Category is addressed, but is incomplete.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) Category is not addressed or is inaccurate.
<b>P&amp;P addresses who is allowed to author the history and physical.</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and shows evidence of strong	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and reasonably	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) Category is addressed, but is incomplete.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) Category is not addressed or is inaccurate.

	<b>Distinguished (100% of points)</b>	<b>Proficient (75% of points)</b>	<b>Apprentice (50% of points)</b>	<b>Novice (0% of points)</b>
	understanding of the topic.	complete, but could be improved.		
<b>P&amp;P addresses when a Discharge Summary is required</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and shows evidence of strong understanding of the topic.	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and reasonably complete, but could be improved.	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) Category is addressed, but is incomplete.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) Category is not addressed or is inaccurate.
<b>P&amp;P addresses timeliness of Discharge Summary</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and shows evidence of strong understanding of the topic.	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and reasonably complete, but could be improved.	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) Category is addressed, but is incomplete.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) Category is not addressed or is inaccurate.
<b>P&amp;P addresses content of the Discharge Summary</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) Category is addressed, but is incomplete.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) Category is not addressed or is inaccurate.

	<b>Distinguished (100% of points)</b>	<b>Proficient (75% of points)</b>	<b>Apprentice (50% of points)</b>	<b>Novice (0% of points)</b>
	shows evidence of strong understanding of the topic.	reasonably complete, but could be improved.		
<b>P&amp;P addresses who is allowed to author the Discharge Summary.</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and shows evidence of strong understanding of the topic.	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and reasonably complete, but could be improved.	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) Category is addressed, but is incomplete.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) Category is not addressed or is inaccurate.
<b>P&amp;P addresses when an Operative Report is required</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and shows evidence of strong understanding of the topic.	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and reasonably complete, but could be improved.	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) Category is addressed, but is incomplete.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) Category is not addressed or is inaccurate.
<b>P&amp;P addresses timeliness of Operative Report</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%)	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%)	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%)	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%)

	<b>Distinguished (100% of points)</b>	<b>Proficient (75% of points)</b>	<b>Apprentice (50% of points)</b>	<b>Novice (0% of points)</b>
	Category is addressed, appropriate, and shows evidence of strong understanding of the topic.	Category is addressed, appropriate, and reasonably complete, but could be improved.	Category is addressed, but is incomplete.	Category is not addressed or is inaccurate.
<b>P&amp;P addresses content of the Operative Report</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and shows evidence of strong understanding of the topic.	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and reasonably complete, but could be improved.	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) Category is addressed, but is incomplete.	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) Category is not addressed or is inaccurate.
<b>P&amp;P addresses who is allowed to author Operative Report.</b>	Points: <b>3</b> (6.00%) Category is addressed, appropriate, and shows evidence of strong understanding of the topic.	Points: <b>2.25</b> (4.50%) Case study is generally accurate and reasonably complete, but could be improved.	Points: <b>1.5</b> (3.00%) Case Study is addressed and sometimes inaccurate or incomplete	Points: <b>0</b> (0.00%) Case Study is not addressed or is inaccurate.