

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

DEPARTMENT Occupational Therapy **DATE** 3/19/10

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Fred Remer / 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>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:

The Occupational Therapy Assessment Plan 2005-2006 as posted has been superseded by an updated plan (dated October 2009) that was obtained directly from the department. The new assessment plan has seven well articulated goals and more specific objectives that address student learning. The objectives address the areas of subject matter, skills and cognitive learning. Accreditation standards are included within the goals and objectives, which were developed collaboratively by OT faculty. The new assessment plan should be forwarded to the committee (email to <joan.hawthorne@und.edu>) and posted to the University Assessment Committee website.

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:

Two types of assessment are performed by the OT Graduate Program: a general evaluation of the program and an assessment of student learning. The updated 2009 Occupational Therapy Assessment Plan contains a separate matrix for each. Phase 2 (or Stage 2) of the plan lists specific assessment methods for each student learning goal and objective. The measures include a mix of direct and indirect measures. The assessment methods are varied and appropriate.

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> </u> | NO <u>X</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>X</u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • Were the results tied to goals for student learning? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u>X</u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments:

The assessment results presented in the report included student retention and progression, the Student Evaluation of Fieldwork Experience (SEFWE) Survey, a student satisfaction with the program survey and an end of curriculum survey. The results of the surveys were favorable to the program. The results provided a general evaluation of the program and did not address student learning. The annual report noted that the 2009 OT Assessment Plan had not yet been fully implemented and that

student learning would be addressed in future years. The results included in the report were indirect measures of student's perceptions. No direct assessment which could be aligned with goals was included in the report. It would be beneficial to see such direct assessment results and their analyses. Some data that were collected (such as the NBCOT results) were not included in the assessment section but are available elsewhere within the annual report (state of the unit section). We note that the board scores are not directly aligned with goals for learning, but perhaps a breakdown of scores is available to faculty. If so, that greater level of detail would certainly be extremely useful in analyzing student learning trends in relation to goals – and in making decisions about curricular changes (when needed).

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

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

YES _____ NO X 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:

The conclusion of the assessment report stated that no curricular changes were made. It further stated that Phase 2 of the assessment (which addressed student learning) had just begun. Future assessment will yield more information on student learning which will be tied to curriculum changes. The report did state that a number of changes were made to the assessment process and methods.

SUMMARY

Strengths

- X A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- X Student learning goals are well-articulated.
- X Assessment methods are clearly described.
- X 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 redesigned OT assessment plan is well articulated and designed. It includes goals and objectives that are tied to student learning. The assessment methods are well selected and aligned with the learning goals and objectives. Not all of the assessment methods have been implemented and the results that were included in the report provided indirect assessment through surveys. The OT Graduate Program states that they plan to further implement their plan in the coming year.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

- X Annual report
- X Appendices (cited in annual report)
- X Other (please describe) Updated OT Graduate Program Assessment Plan (Oct. 2009)
- X Assessment plan (as posted)
- X Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	<u>Fred Remer</u>	<u>Joan Hawthorne</u>
	Department	<u>Atmospheric Sciences</u>	<u>Academic Affairs</u>
	Phone Number	<u>777-4055</u>	<u>777-4684</u>
	e-mail	<u>rem@aero.und.edu</u>	<u>joan.hawthorne@und.edu</u>

Section 1: __Y__ Section 2: __Y__ Section 3: __N__ Section 4: __N__

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