

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2008-09 Annual Reports
UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Athletic Training—Sports Medicine DATE 4/26/10

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Dex Perkins, Joan Hawthorne

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> </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:

In general, the goals generally seem like an accurate description of what students should know. To an outside reader, some of the goals seem superficial, and we wonder if this is really all you mean (e.g., “students learn that the athletic trainer renders service or treatment under the direction of a physician” – which seems like a small piece of information and we wonder if you mean something more in-depth). In some cases, we wondered if you are phrasing something as a knowledge goal when what you really want students to know is how to DO it. For example, do you want students to have information about when an athletic trainer should recommend discontinuation of services (goal 6)? Or do you want to see that a student “makes the right call” in determining when services should be discontinued? If you mean the second, perhaps the goal should say “The student learns to, in collaboration with a physician, determine the right timing for discontinuation of AT services based on optimization of program benefits. The student also learns to complete appropriate patient notes at the time of discontinuation.” This wording places the emphasis on the students’ ability to DO rather than the students’ knowledge, and it may be what you’re really aiming at.

In addition to the Departmental goals, please also consider UND’s Institutional and Essential Studies goals for student learning (shown in alignment within parentheses) and identify which goals are similar to departmental goals.

- 1 Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”)
 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)
 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage)
 4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”)
 5 Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”)
 6 Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”)
 7 Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)
 8 Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)

Comments regarding departmental goals and alignment of departmental goals with institutional and Essential Studies goals:

There is no clear alignment between program goals and ES/Institutional goals.

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> </u> | NO <u>X</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:

You have a nice mix of direct and indirect methods, and it’s clear that the performance assessments (“clinical competency assessments,” e.g.) will provide you with very useful information. However, you don’t connect the methods to the goals – which methods provide you with information about achievement of the various goals? This becomes important because it is

difficult to know what to change if you don't know which outcomes are well-addressed in the current curriculum and teaching, vs. which seem to be areas of difficulty for your students. You apparently have an alignment between goal and method based on later sections of the report. But we did not find your assessment plan posted on the website set up for that purpose (email a copy of the plan to <joan.hawthorne@und.edu> and we'll ensure that it gets posted); lacking the plan, we had to intuit the alignment between method and goal.

Finally, we noted that there are elements of the report which are confusing for outside readers, e.g., "100% accuracy" and "85% accuracy" – but we're not certain if you mean accuracy on all assessments or what (if this is across-the-board accuracy, it seems surprising that juniors and seniors would be at a lower level than sophomores).

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES__X__	NO__	QUALIFIED Y/N __
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals?	YES__X__	NO__	QUALIFIED Y/N __
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?	YES__X__	NO__	QUALIFIED Y/N __
• Were the results tied to goals for student learning?	YES__X__	NO__	QUALIFIED Y/N __

Comments:

We note that you are linking the data collected to specific goals which is very good. We also see your conclusions about the meaning of results, i.e., you provide detail about your findings or conclusions. And these are clearly aligned with the seven program goals. Your reports of very specific conclusions and findings (e.g., "students can evaluate joints empirically and clinically," "students still cannot perform diagnostic reasoning...") demonstrate the existence of data supporting those conclusions, and you tell us the sorts of data which support these conclusions. So although we don't see actual data in this report, you've provided excellent evidence of your collection, analysis, and use of assessment information.

In addition to departmental goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. Indicate any goals for which the department presents findings, and, for indicated items, describe findings below. .

- _____ 1 Communication – written or oral ("able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience")
- _____ 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be intellectually curious"; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)
- _____ 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be intellectually creative"; explore, discover, engage)
- _____ 4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning ("apply empirical data...analyze graphical information")
- _____ 5 Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use")
- _____ 6 Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...")
- _____ 7 Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelong learning")
- _____ 8 Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both for their communities and for the world")

Comments regarding results and the application of results to departmental, institutional and Essential Studies goals:
Not applicable.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?	YES__X__	NO__	QUALIFIED Y/N __
• If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	YES__X__	NO__	QUALIFIED Y/N __

Comments:

You are not only "closing the loop" (e.g., planning changes to classes to improve student performance on goals 6 and 7) but also reviewing changes made based on previous assessment efforts (e.g. describing the improvements you're seeing based on a recently implemented capstone requirement).

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:

Based on what we find in this report, Athletic Training faculty appear to be doing an excellent job of collecting data that directly relate to intended program outcomes, analyzing that data on a regular basis, drawing conclusions about meaning, and then making program changes (when called for) based on what's been learned. We're really pleased to see the good work your program is able to report. It would be really helpful in future years if you would ensure that your assessment plan is posted on the university's website established for that purpose, and if your annual assessment report would be incorporated into the report posted on the annual report website. And, as mentioned above, we recommend taking another look at program goals to ensure that what's named is consistent with what's meant.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Annual report | <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment plan (as posted) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Appendices (cited in annual report) | <input type="checkbox"/> Previous assessment review |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe) | |

Reviewer(s):	Name	<u>Joan Hawthorne</u>	<u>Dexter Perkins</u>	<u> </u>
	Department	<u>Academic Affairs</u>	<u>Geology/Geol Eng</u>	<u> </u>
	Phone Number	<u>777-4684</u>	<u>777-2991</u>	<u> </u>
	e-mail	<u>joan.hawthorne@und.edu</u>	<u>dexter.perkins@und.edu</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