

## UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

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

DEPARTMENT Physician Assistant (PA) Program DATE 8/31/1006

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW: Cheryl Saunders & Nabil Slueiman

#### 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>    </u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>x</u>    |
| • Do goals address student learning?  | YES <u>x</u>    | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |

#### Comments:

**Undergraduate:** N/A

**Graduate:** The annual report refers to the goals and objectives that are detailed in the PA Program's Assessment Plan. In the PA Program's Assessment Plan, the goals and objectives are clearly articulated and do address student learning.

#### 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:** N/A

**Graduate:** The methodology used to assess student learning includes a variety of measures including summative testing (objective and clinical testing), written/graded assignments along with preceptors' evaluations, lecturers' feedback and students' (current and former) feedback and the National PA Boards. In addition, students meet with faculty advisor monthly with the exception of March.

#### ASSESSMENT RESULTS

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

#### Comments:

**Undergraduate:** N/A

**Graduate:** There was reference to assessment results, but the results were not documented in the annual report.

## 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:** N/A

**Graduate:** Based on student and faculty feedback, a reevaluation of course content and delivery in three courses occurred. As a result, changes were made in course faculty, content, and sequencing of material within the three courses.

## 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 Physician Assistants (PA) Program has a well-documented assessment plan. However, the goals and objectives of this program are not clearly stated in the annual report. The goals and objectives do address student learning and therefore, should be included in the annual report. Assessment methods are clear and varied in assessing student learning and the evaluation of the program. Nevertheless, these findings and/or results are not documented in the annual report. The actions taken after the results are, but the findings are not reported. The PA Program's assessment plan aligns with student learning outcomes and faculty activities to facilitate student learning. It would be good to see these goals/objectives along with student learning outcomes documented in the annual report.

Reviewer(s):	Name	Cheryl Saunders	Nabil Slueimena
	Department	University Learning Center	Civil Engineering
	Phone Number	7-4390	7-3997
	E-mail	cherylsaunders@mail.und.nodak.edu	nabilslueiman@mail.und.edu

-----

Section 1: ☐N☐ Section 2: ☐Y☐ Section 3: ☐?☐ 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