UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2008-09 Annual Reports $\underline{UNDERGRADUATE\ PROGRAMS}$

| DEPART | MENT Histotechnician Certificate | | DATE | C | 3/24/10 | - |
|--|---|---|--|---|--|----|
| COMMIT | TEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVI | EW_Barbar | a Combs & | JoAnn | e Yearwood | |
| 1. STUDEN | NT LEARNING GOALS | | | | | |
| • | Were any goals referenced? If so, were goals well articulated? Do goals address student learning? | YESX_ YESX_ YES | | QUAL | LIFIED Y/N LIFIED Y/N LIFIED Y/N _X_ | |
| Comments: | | | | | | |
| and is posted | ent plan for the Histotechnician Certificate is em d on the Assessment Committee website. The plan o have been updated. Four student learning goal: ulated. | posted was cr | eated in the 2 | 2005-20 | 006 academic year and doe | S |
| (shown in al departmentaX11 | o the Departmental goals, please also consider Unignment within parentheses). Use 'X' to identify I goals. Communication – written or oral ("able to write a Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "b Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "b Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluative Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of diversity Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelong Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both for | und speak in va be intellectually be intellectually "apply empiric atefor effect by and use that a g learning") | I Studies goarious setting y curious"; and or creative"; e cal dataand ive, efficient understandin | s with a nalyze, explore, alyze grat, and ethag") | h are similar to the reference sense of purpose/audience synthesize, evaluate) discover, engage) aphical information") hical use") | ed |
| Comments r goals: | regarding departmental goals and alignment of a | departmental g | oals with ins | stitution | nal and Essential Studies | |
| Learning Go interactions Goal 1: Con Goals 2-3 si report, it wa updated to it | four Departmental goals appear to relate directly all 4: Demonstrate appropriate professional comwith other students, faculty, laboratory personne numication. It is possible that the program's Leance Goal 1 is related to the knowledge and applies stated that the Histology Advisory Committee sunvolve more critical thinking skills. If accomplishing goals. As currently written however, the conne | munication ski l and patients i urning Goal 1 r cation of theori uggested that s ed, there may l | lls, especiallis aligned with the selate to the selate to the selate to the selate to the selate th | y object th Institut Institut iples of for the H rect link | ive 4.2 Employ appropriate utional and Essential Studi ional and Essential Studies histology. In the annual Histotechniques courses be | es |
| 2. ASSESS | MENT METHODS | | | | | |
| Were any sp | ecific assessment methods referenced? If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual | YESX | NO | QUAL | LIFIED Y/N | |
| • | goals? Were both direct and indirect assessment | YESX | NO | QUAI | LIFIED Y/N | |
| • | methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach? | YES <i>X</i> | NO | QUAI | LIFIED Y/N | |

Comments:

We read two documents to respond to this section of the report. First, we read the assessment plan, which noted that "performance evaluations" were used in separate courses. No further detail was provided as to what form the "evaluations" took. Second, we read the Assessment of Student Learning report provided to us by Dr. Ruth Paur, Assistant Professor in the Department of Pathology. The following assessments were listed in this report: National Registry Exam (aligned with Goals 1-3), Clinical Site Supervisor Evaluations and the Faculty Review of the Slide Evaluation Process (aligned with Goals 1-4), graduate and employee surveys, and the Program Advisory Committee's annual review meeting. No alignment was stated between the surveys and the Program Advisory Committee's annual meeting but it appears that both may address student learning in all four areas. There was limited description about the Clinical Site Supervisor Evaluations and so we do not know what form this evaluation takes whether oral or written.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

• Were the results tied to goals for student learning?

Comments:

Results were provided related to the National Registry Exam, Clinical Site Supervisors Evaluations, Faculty Review of the Slide Evaluation Process, graduate surveys, and the annual Histology Advisory Committee meeting. According to the 2009 assessment report, the student pass rate on the exam was 100%, supervisor evaluations demonstrated that student were proficient in meeting requirements, the slide evaluation process demonstrated student progress across two semesters, and the single graduate survey result was positive. It was not clear what data the Histology Advisory Committee reviews during its annual meeting, but it was reported that there were discussions that lead to program changes. The annual meeting itself is not an assessment and it would be helpful to know what that committee reviews to make decisions that result in program change.

YES X NO

QUALIFIED Y/N

In addition to departmental goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. Use 'X' to identify those results which are applicable to institutional/Essential Studies goal achievement. For indicated items, please describe findings in the appropriate section below.

| A to lucil | thry those results which are applicable to institutional/Essential Studies goal achievement. Tor indicated items, |
|-------------|---|
| please desc | cribe findings in the appropriate section 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 dataanalyze graphical information") |
| 5 | Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluatefor 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: It was not possible for us to determine which results were applicable to goals. It may be that the National Registry Exam may be applicable to goals 1-4.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment

| results repor | ted? If so, do curricular or other im changes arising from assessme | provements/ | YES | _X | NO | QUALIFIED Y/N | | |
|--|---|--|---|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | directly address goals for stude | | YES | | NO | QUALIFIED Y/NX | | |
| meeting of the development data or asses | ne Histology Program Advisory of a calendar of events and cla | Committee including rification of course Committee in making the committee in the c | ig: new expecto ng reco | lecture itions f mmend | es for Path for Path 362 ations. Thi | supervisor assessments and the 360, Path 362 and Path 363 and the 7 and Path 368. We are not sure what s information would be helpful in als, and assessments. | | |
| SUMMARY | Strengths | | | | Areas fo | or Improvement | | |
| | | | No specific plan for assessment is in placeStudent learning goals are not well-articulatedX_Assessment methods are not clearly describedAssessment methods are not appropriately selectedAssessment methods are not well-implementedA single type of assessment methods predominatesNo results are reportedResults are not clearly tied to closing the loop(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.) IONS: The that student-learning goals are well articulated and assessments are improvement and student achievement. We suggest that the work | | | | | |
| | am Advisory Committee be furt provements is clear. | her clarified so that | their re | ole in re | elation to a | ssessments, data and date-driven | | |
| MATERIA | LS REVIEWED | | | | | | | |
| | al report ndices (cited in annual report) (please describe) <i>Annual Asses</i> | - | F | reviou | s assessmei | (as posted)—AY 2005-06 nt review | | |
| Reviewer(s): | Department Phone Number e-mail | | ail.und | .edu | Teachin 777-394 joanney | Yearwood 1g & Learning 47 earwood@mail.und.edu | | |
| Section 1: | Y Section 2: _Y Se | ection 3: _Y | Section | ı 4: _?_ | | | | |
| Coding Key: Y N NA ? | yes, this is done appropria no, this is not done at all, no information available | or it is not done in re | | - | | rning completely and appropriately done | | |