

# UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

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

DEPARTMENT Family Medicine Clerkship DATE August 31, 2006

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Lana Rakow and Beth Bjerke

### 1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

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

#### Comments:

**Undergraduate:**

**Graduate:**

**[Professional]:** This program is a predoctoral eight-week clerkship. Goals are well articulated. No assessment plan was located online, however.

### 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:**

**Graduate:**

**[Professional]:** Each objective has documentation methods, including preceptor evaluations and oversight by a clinical faculty member. Students present cases and present a project report. A final examination is conducted

### 3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

- |  |              |                |                           |
|--|--------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Were any assessment results reported?  | YES <u>x</u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? | YES <u>x</u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?            | YES <u>x</u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |
| • Were the results tied to goals for student learning?   | YES <u>x</u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |

#### Comments:

**Undergraduate:**

**Graduate:**

**[Professional]:** One clerkship has been completed. All students successfully completed the final exam and received at least satisfactory evaluations by preceptors and faculty. All students submitted acceptable research projects.

#### 4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?

YES ☒ NO ☐ QUALIFIED Y/N ☐

- If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?

YES ☒ NO ☐ QUALIFIED Y/N ☐

*Comments:*

**Undergraduate:**

**Graduate:**

**[Professional]:** No curricular changes were made but more faculty contact has been built into the program mid-clerkship to provide more feedback to students.,

#### 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:

The program has well-articulated goals with appropriate means for evaluating student learning. Students seem to be learning at a satisfactory level with faculty attentiveness to how learning might be improved. Indirect assessment methods are less clear, although implied in the role that students are expected to take in considering their own learning. An assessment plan is not apparently available electronically. Otherwise assessment is well-done, even commendable.

Reviewer(s):	Name	<u>Lana Rakow</u>	<u>Elizabeth Bjerke</u>	<u>                    </u>
	Department	<u>Communication</u>	<u>Aviation</u>	<u>                    </u>
	Phone Number	<u>7-2287</u>	<u>73922</u>	<u>                    </u>
	e-mail	<u><a href="mailto:lanarakow@mail.und.edu">lanarakow@mail.und.edu</a></u>	<u><a href="mailto:ebjerke@aero.und.edu">ebjerke@aero.und.edu</a></u>	<u>                    </u>

-----

Section 1: Y 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