

**2016 Report of Current Status for an Education Program
in
Emergency Medical Services-Paramedic
at
Crowder College
CoA Program Reference:600397**

Sponsoring Institution and Personnel

Sponsoring Institution

Crowder College
601 Laclede Ave.
Neosho, MO 64850
Phone:
Institution Type: N/A

President/CEO

Jennifer Methvin PhD
601 Laclede Ave.
Neosho, MO 64850
Phone:(417) 455-5505
Fax:
Email:jennifermethvin@crowder.edu

Dean/Administrator

Edward Stephens MS
601 Laclede Ave.
Neosho, MO 64850
Phone:(417) 455-5605
Fax:(417) 455-5511
Email:edwardstephens@crowder.edu

Program Director

Kristin Spencer MS, NRP
601 Laclede Ave.
Neosho, MO 64850
Phone:(417) 455-5505
Fax:
Email:kristinspencer@crowder.edu

Affiliates

Barry-Lawrence Ambulance District - Clinical Affiliate - Monett, MO
Bella Vista Fire Department - Clinical Affiliate - Bella Vista, AR
Bentonville, AR Fire Department - Clinical Affiliate - Bentonville, AR
Central EMS - Clinical Affiliate - Fayetteville, AR
Cox Health System - Clinical Affiliate - Springfield, MO
EMSA - Clinical Affiliate - Tulsa, OK
EMSA Ambulance - Clinical Affiliate - OKC , OK
Freeman Ambulance Service - Clinical Affiliate - Anderson, MO
Freeman Neosho Hospital - Clinical Affiliate - Neosho, MO
Freeman West Hospital - Clinical Affiliate - Joplin, MO
Grove EMS - Clinical Affiliate - Grove, OK
Integrus Hospital/EMS - Clinical Affiliate - Miami, OK
Mercy Hospital - Clinical Affiliate - Joplin, Carthage, MO
METS Ambulance - Clinical Affiliate - Joplin, MO
Newton County Ambulance District - Clinical Affiliate - Neosho/Joplin, MO
Quapaw Tribe/EMS - Clinical Affiliate - Quapaw, OK
Rogers Fire Department - Clinical Affiliate - Rogers, AR

Satellites

Current Program Statistics

CoA Reference: 600397

Program Enrollment and Attrition Table with Current and Past Five Years' Data(if available):

Enrollment Year	Enrollment Date	Graduation Date	Estimated Number of Applicants	Maximum Number of Students	Number Initially Enrolled	Number Enrolled After Class Start	Total Enrollment Number	'In Progress' To-Date	Non-Academic Attrition	General Education Courses Attrition	Professional Courses Attrition	Attrition	Percent Retention	# Grads to Date
2016	1/4/2016	12/10/2016	20	30	17	0	17	0	2	0	0	2	88.2 %	15
2016	8/12/2016	5/13/2017	20	20	15	0	15	15	0	0	0	0	100.0 %	0
2016	8/12/2016	5/13/2017	20	20	12	0	12	12	0	0	0	0	100.0 %	0
2015	8/7/2015	5/14/2016	20	20	11	0	11		0	0			11/2/2016	11
2015	1/2/2015	12/11/2015	20	30	8	0	8	0	3	0	0	3	62.5 %	5
2015	8/7/2015	5/14/2016	35	35	16	0	16	0	5	0	2	7	56.3 %	9
2014	1/2/2014	12/12/2014	35	35	33	0	33	0	11	0	2	13	60.6 %	20
2014	8/4/2014	5/16/2015	20	20	25	0	25	-1	4	0	1	5	80.0 %	21
2013	8/2/2013	5/17/2014	25	25	24	0	24	0	2	0	6	8	66.7 %	16
2013	6/3/2013	5/17/2014	35	35	30	0	30	0	8	0	0	8	73.3 %	22
2012	8/13/2012	5/17/2013	10	15	8	0	8	0	2	0	1	3	62.5 %	5

Outcomes Summary

	Graduation Year. Class of...							Threshold	3 yr Total 2015 to 2013	5 yr Total 2015 to 2011
	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010			
Graduates	35	26	58	5	0	0	0		89	89
Outcomes Assessments									3 yr Avg 2015 to 2013	5 yr Avg 2015 to 2011
Attrition	20.5 %	24.2 %	33.3 %	37.5 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %		31.3 %	31.3 %
Retention	79.5 %	75.8 %	66.7 %	62.5 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	70%	68.8 % *	68.8 % *
Positive Placement	45.7 %	65.4 %	77.6 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	70 %	69.7 %	69.7 %
National Registry Written - % of grads Attempting	62.9 %	69.2 %	56.9 %	80.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	70 %		
National Registry Written - Pass Rate - Success	77.3 %	72.2 %	66.7 %	100.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	70 %	70.9 %	70.9 %
National Registry Practical - % of grads Attempting	51.4 %	50.0 %	75.9 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	70 %		
National Registry Practical - Pass Rate - Success	100.0 %	84.6 %	97.7 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	70 %	94.7 %	94.7 %
Comprehensive Final Written - % of grads Attempting	40.0 %	73.1 %	100.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	70 %		
Comprehensive Final Written - Pass Rate - Success	92.9 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	70 %	100.0 %	100.0 %
Comprehensive Final Practical - % of grads Attempting	40.0 %	73.1 %	100.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	70 %		
Comprehensive Final Practical - Pass Rate - Success	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	70 %	100.0 %	100.0 %
State Exam Written - % of grads Attempting	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	70 %		
State Exam Written - Pass Rate - Success	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	70 %	0.0 %	0.0 %
State Exam Practical - % of grads Attempting	0.0 %	0.0 %	69.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	70 %		
State Exam Practical - Pass Rate - Success	0.0 %	0.0 %	92.5 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	70 %	92.5 %	92.5 %
Employer Survey - % sent	0.0 %	70.6 %	59.1 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	100.0 %	68.9 % *	68.9 % *
Employer Survey - Cognitive - Success	0.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	100.0 %		
Employer Survey - Psychomotor - Success	0.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	100.0 %		
Employer Survey - Affective - Success	0.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	100.0 %		
Graduate Survey - % sent	40.0 %	57.7 %	53.4 %	100.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	100.0 %	57.3 % *	57.3 % *

	Graduation Year. Class of...									
Graduate Survey - Cognitive - Success	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	100.0 %		
Graduate Survey - Psychomotor - Success	50.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	100.0 %		
Graduate Survey - Affective - Success	75.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	100.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %	100.0 %		

* Threshold not met

	Enrollment Year									
Enrollment	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010	Threshold	3 yr Total 2015 to 2013	5 yr Total 2015 to 2011
Enrollment	44	35	58	54	8	0	0		147	155

Graduates by Enrollment Cohort

Enrollment Year	Enrollment Date	On-time Graduation Date	Graduated in (year)							# Grads to Date
			2016	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010	
2016	1/4/2016	12/10/2016	15							15
2016	8/12/2016	5/13/2017								0
2016	8/12/2016	5/13/2017								0
2015	8/7/2015	5/14/2016	11							11
2015	1/2/2015	12/11/2015		5						5
2015	8/7/2015	5/14/2016	9							9
2014	1/2/2014	12/12/2014			20					20
2014	8/4/2014	5/16/2015		21						21
2013	8/2/2013	5/17/2014			16					16
2013	6/3/2013	5/17/2014			22					22
2012	8/13/2012	5/17/2013				5				5
Total Graduates by Year =			35	26	58	5	0	0	0	124

Examination Results

Evaluation System: National Registry Written

Analysis:

Although Crowder barely met the minimum threshold for first-time passing, we constantly strive to improve our pass rates. Although we did implement something called the "Green Light Program" that required students to take a comprehensive final through FSDAP and get a 72% overall in order to challenge the NREMT cognitive exam, a few students complained to the office of the Vice President of Academic Affairs and consequently is now on hold. An analysis of our Green Light Program was performed by Mr. Doug York and Gina Riggs, who opined the program was fair and clearly explained to the students. We were having a tremendous success rate for those who went through the Green Light Program first prior to taking the NREMT cognitive (a nearly 99% first-time pass rate) and thus, as a Program Director, is tough to suspend. I have been meeting with my direct supervisor and administrators to outline a "Green Light Program" that is deemed fair and defensible to everyone involved.

Action:

1. Create "high-stakes" module exams for paramedic students (e.g., airway, trauma, medical) etc. so that if a student does not pass a "high-stakes" exam, they must drop the course at that time. These will be implemented during the first cohort of students in 2017.
2. Continue to collectively work on a "Green Light" Program that is deemed fair and defensible by students, faculty and administration.
3. Integrate the new NREMT Psychomotor Competency Portfolio beginning with the next cohort of students (January, 2017) and analyze the effects, if any, on the NREMT written exam.

Evaluation System: National Registry Practical

Analysis:

When able, Crowder EMS uses at least a 5:1 ratio for practical skills training. I believe this explains why we have such a high first-time pass rate on our psychomotor skills testing.

Action:

Evaluation System: Comprehensive Final Written

Analysis:

Action:

Evaluation System: Comprehensive Final Practical

Analysis:

When able, Crowder EMS uses at least a 5:1 ratio for practical skills training. I believe this explains why we have such a high first-time pass rate on our psychomotor skills testing.

Action:

No action plan is needed for these cohorts of students.

Evaluation System: State Exam Written

Analysis:

Not applicable.

Action:

No action plan is required, since there are no state written exams in Missouri for paramedic level students. They are all completed through the NREMT.

Evaluation System: State Exam Practical
Analysis: Not applicable.
Action: There are no state practical exams. They are all tested by the NIEMT and supervised by an NREMT representative.

Surveys - Cognitive Domain

Evaluation System: Employer Surveys - Cognitive
Cut Score:
Analysis: I have contacted Lynn Caruthers and asked how I can improve survey return rates. She suggested I distribute e-mails to the Directors, which I have. Each time I stress how important it is to complete the surveys to no avail. This is a deficiency I, as the Program Director, can address but not necessarily remedy. However, the return has been slowly climbing.
Action: I will continue to send out e-mail reminders to the Directors regarding the employer surveys encouraging them to complete.

Evaluation System: Graduate Survey - Cognitive
Cut Score:
Analysis: For 2015, we received 15 total responses from two different cohorts of students. In the cognitive domain, the SD was 4.4; the second cohort 4.6. There were no #1's or #2's selected under any of the cognitive domain questions.

For the cohort that graduated in May of 2016, we have received five (5) graduation reports to date. In the cognitive domain, the SD was 3.4. It appears the same person answered #1 in every question within the cognitive domain. Otherwise, all other responses were no lower than 3's.
Action: I will continue to send out surveys expressing the importance of them for the successful continuation of our program.

Surveys - Psychomotor Domain

Evaluation System: Employer Surveys - Psychomotor
Cut Score:
Analysis: I have contacted Lynn Caruthers and asked how I can improve survey return rates. She suggested I distribute e-mails to the Directors, which I have. Each time I stress how important it is to complete the surveys to no avail. This is a deficiency I, as the Program Director, can address but not necessarily remedy. However, the return has been slowly climbing.
Action: I will continue to send the area Directors reminder e-mails regarding the surveys and how important they are.

Evaluation System: Graduate Survey - Psychomotor
Cut Score:
Analysis: For the 2015 cohort (15 surveys), the mean SD: was 3.9 and 4.2, respectively.

The May, 2016 cohort of students (5) revealed a SD of 3.1 +/- 1.4. Again, it appears it is one student who answered all questions with a #1.

Action: We have been advised by a few students that they would like to see more ambulance hours and less hospital hours. There were also requests for more skills training.

Next semester, we are making one entire day a SIM lab day to give students more time performing patient care and learning skills.

Surveys - Affective Domain

Evaluation System: Employer Surveys - Affective

Cut Score:

Analysis: I have contacted Lynn Caruthers and asked how I can improve survey return rates. She suggested I distribute e-mails to the Directors, which I have. Each time I stress how important it is to complete the surveys to no avail. This is a deficiency I, as the Program Director, can address but not necessarily remedy. However, the return has been slowly climbing.

Action: I will continue to send the area Directors reminder e-mails regarding the surveys and how important they are.

Evaluation System: Graduate Survey - Affective

Cut Score:

Analysis: For the cohort that graduated in May of 2015, the total responses reflected a SD of: 4.2 +/- 0.6; the second 2015 cohort revealed a SD: 4.8 +/- 0.4.

For the class that graduated in May of 2016, the affective responses showed a SD: 3.5 +/- 1.4. Again, it appears one student consistently scored a #1 on all his responses--in every category.

One student commented: "the program helped me to be very ethical and polite."

Action:

Attrition / Retention

Evaluation System: Attrition / Retention

Analysis: As I researched the attrition rates for 2015-2016, it is evident the reasons for attrition among students were very different. Some students (those who dropped due to poor grades) we can try to work with more closely. A few dropped due to severe marital or personal issues and after counseling determined they had no other choice. One student was caught cheating on an exam. A few students enrolled, then simply changed their minds; some enrolled but never showed and one forged her nursing license and thus was immediately expelled from the program.

Action: I would like to be able to examine our causes for attrition and extract one identifiable cause, but that is simply not the case. Those who have marital or other personal problems are students for which we can try to counsel, but ultimately it is their decision to drop the class. Those that change their minds after enrolling usually do so after they review their financial situation and determine they cannot afford to move temporarily to SW Missouri to complete the second semester of the program.

What we can do (instructors) is forge a better relationship with our students so they can feel we are approachable and are willing to help if and when appropriate.

Positive Placement

Evaluation System: Positive Placement

Analysis: Most of our students are sponsored by local ambulance districts with whom they work. Consequently, when they graduate from our program they have a job. For those not affiliated with an ambulance agency, they too can find a job with ease in our region.

We also have a multitude of international students, and it can be difficult to track their location and job status. However, I have used online social networking in order to track those that I can.

Action: Once the Fall, 2016 cohort of students take their examinations, I predict the positive placement rate for 2016 to dramatically rise.

Program Information

Program Title: Emergency Medical Services - Paramedic

Name of certificate or degree awarded:

Program Design

	Award Level 1	Award Level 2
a. Type of award granted:	Certificate	Associate
b. Length of Program in Months:	10	20
c. Length of Program in Academic Sessions:	2	4
d. Total Credit Hours Required:	36	65
e. Type of Credits (e.g., semester, quarter):	Semester	Semester
f. Total Program Tuition and Fees - Resident:	\$5,920.00	\$8,211.00
g. Total Program Tuition and Fees - Non-Resident:	\$5,920.00	\$9,197.00

Program Budget

a. Program's fiscal year begins on (month/date):	7/1	
b. Indicate the program's actual expenditures for:	Current Fiscal Year to Date	Previous Fiscal Year
	Total \$0.00	\$0.00

Is the budget sufficient to ensure achievement of the programs's goal and outcomes?:

Yes

Detailed Analysis of Insufficient Budget:

Action Plan for Insufficient Budget:

Comments

Distance Education

Is any portion of the program offered Yes
through distance learning?:

Percentage of the program delivered by 50%
distance:

List the courses that are totally web based EMTP 201-02
(ie no face-to-face instruction):

List the courses that are interactive video
conferencing to remote locations:

Description of Distance Mode List of courses delivered in that mode

Crowder EMS uses Jones and Bartlett EMTP 201-02 (hybrid) navigate learning platform system to deliver our curriculum. Each cohort of students has weekly readings, forum discussions, writing assignments, quizzes, live webinars and module exams.