

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Feedback to Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2004-2005 Annual Reports

DEPARTMENT Athletic Training (Family Medicine) DATE May 1, 2006

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Beth Bjerke, Tom Steen

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> x </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments:

Undergraduate:

There was no assessment plan for Athletic Training posted to the Assessment Committee website. Due to this lack of resource it was not able to be determined if the department had specific goals laid out for student learning.

Although goals are not specifically spelled out in the annual report, they appear to be assumed: that UND aims to train future athletic trainers so that they meet national standards (NATA) of the profession and so that they have the knowledge/skill to successfully complete NATA's board exam.

If the program has more specific learning goals or if they have "in-progress" goals to use as indicators of student success as they go through the program, it would be good to list or summarize them here.

Graduate:

Athletic Training is only an undergraduate program.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

- | | | | |
|--|------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced? | YES <u> x </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? | YES <u> x </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach? | YES <u> x </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments:

Undergraduate:

Besides the Board Exam, the program just began using a software program (ATEX) which is designed, in part, to assess student learning and save it electronically. It's not clear from the report how data collected and stored via ATEX aligns with the assumed goals above, but the program intends to use it to analyze students' strengths and weaknesses during their clinical experiences, which obviously fits into the general goal of training future AT's. Both the ATEX and the Board Exam are direct measures; the program also collects indirect information via "student assessment questionnaires" (USAT? Their own?), ATEX, and former students (also not spelled out how this is done). As a package of methods, they seem to be reasonable and useful.

Due to not having the actual assessment plan for the department to review, it was unclear to see how the assessment methods fit with the program goals. In particular, I suspect the program measures student progress during the program, and it would be good to make that part of the assessment plan. Most of the assessment reported here focuses on summative assessment (end of program).

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Were the results tied to goals for student learning?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

Undergraduate:

The program used the Board Exam results to make some important curriculum changes to better prepare students for improved success in future exams. They also responded to changes in professional standards by adding new courses.

Other than use of the Board Exam results, it was difficult to see how the program is linking particular results to program change. For example, although the report indicates that student opinions are positive—both current and former—it does not indicate which elements are positive nor indicate how student opinion results are factored into program planning. Also, perhaps because its use is new, no ATEEx results are reported; however, results from the software sound like they will be able to add a great deal to the picture of student learning in the program.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
• If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

Undergraduate: The program reports that have made some important decisions regarding their students' learning and that these decisions were informed by assessment results.

5. SUMMARY

Strengths

- ☒ A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ☐ Student learning goals are well-articulated.
- ☒ Assessment methods are clearly described.
- ☒ Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
- ☒ Assessment methods are well-implemented.
- ☒ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
- ☒ Results are reported.
- ☒ Results are tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

Areas for Improvement

- ☐ No specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ☐ Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not clearly described.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
- ☐ A single type of assessment methods predominates.
- ☐ No results are reported.
- ☐ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

See suggestions in the sections above. In our view, it seems like the department of Athletic Training has been engaging in numerous assessment activities. However, we think the program goals are probably a bit more focused and clear than what is presented here, it would be necessary to have the department's actual assessment plan available for review. And the new ATEEx software sounds like it has very good potential to collect more/new information about student learning. It will be interesting to see how that works out.

Reviewer(s):	Name	Beth Bjerke	Tom Steen
	Department	Aviation	PEXS
	Phone Number	7-3922	7-4343
	e-mail	ebjerke@aero.und.edu	thomas_steen@und.nodak.edu

Section 1: __?__ Section 2: __Y__ Section 3: __Y__ Section 4: __Y__

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well
- N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA = no information available
- ? = action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done