| DEPARTMENT Patho | ology – Certificate in Hematol | logy/Hemosta | sis DATI | E3/24/10 |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| COMMITTEE MEMBE | R(S) CONDUCTING REVI | EWFred | Remer, Jos | an Hawthorne |
| 1. STUDENT LEARNING | GOALS | | | |
| • Do goals addres Comments: | s well articulated? ss student learning? | YES_X_ | NO | QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N |
| Goals are well-articulated an | d clear. | | | |
| (shown in alignment within p which are similar to the reference which are similar and reasonable with a similar and responsible with a similar a | arentheses). Use 'U' (undergrade enced departmental goals. written or oral ("able to write as soning – critical thinking (or "be soning – creative thinking (or "be soning – quantitative reasoning (cy ("be able to access and evaluantstrate understanding of diversit ("commit themselves to lifelong p ("share responsibility both for mental goals and alignment of all is addressed within expected less and addressed within expected less and alignment of all is addressed within expected less and alignment of | duate) or 'G' (g and speak in variantellectually of e intellectually "apply empiricatefor effecting y and use that use learning") their communicate | raduate) to ideas settings curious"; and creative"; exal dataand ve, efficient, understanding ties and for the coals with instantials. | splore, discover, engage) slyze graphical information") , and ethical use") g") the world") stitutional and Essential Studies |
| methods approp goals? • Were both directions are considered to the constant of the constant o | ifically chosen assessment riately aligned with individual at and indirect assessment components of a "multiple" | YES_X | NO | QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N |
| Comments: | | | | |
| Each of the four goals was al | igned with specific data sources, | including both | n direct and i | indirect sources. |
| work products in various class discrepancy. Although we re- hope that the exam results are | sses, although the data to be ana cognize that nationally standard | lyzed comes fro ized scores are ou're able to br | om the natior a very good eak down sti | nent information is to be collected from nal exam – we were confused by this I measure for a program like yours, we udent scores by topic and see specific |
| 3. ASSESSMENT RESULT | rs | | | |
| 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? If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? Were the results tied to goals for student learning? | YES_X_ NO YES_X_ NO YES_X NO | QUALIFIED Y/N |
|--|--|--|
| Comments: | | |
| National board scores were cited as "excellent" although this However, 100% of UND students passed the national boards. although example data were not included. E.g., "The categor reported that the students had increased their skills significant conclusions would make the report more readable to those out all data within the assessment report. | Reference was made to rical coordinator reviewe tly" Including a bit o | specific results in other areas as well, and the performance evaluations and finformation to support these |
| In addition to departmental goals, some assessment results ma 'U' (undergraduate) or 'G' (graduate) to identify those results achievement. For indicated items, please describe findings in _yes1 Communication – written or oral ("able to write ar2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (5 Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluated for the different of the different o | which are applicable to the appropriate section be and speak in various setting intellectually curious"; a e intellectually creative"; "apply empirical dataa atefor effective, efficient y and use that understand g learning") their communities and for the departmental, institution | institutional/Essential Studies goal below gs with a sense of purpose/audience") analyze, synthesize, evaluate) explore, discover, engage) analyze graphical information") ent, and ethical use") ling") or the world") onal and Essential Studies goals: |
| 4. CLOSING THE LOOP | iewing inai siuaenis nave | г ининей сотрененсу. |
| Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported? • If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning? | YES_X NO YESX NO | QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N |
| Comments: | | |
| One example of a change involves adjusting the method of conassessment itself was inappropriate for their purposes. Howe practice on high level questions prior to the assessment itself. | ver, plans are also in the | works to provide students with more |
| SUMMARY | Arags | o for Improvement |
| Strengths _X A specific plan for assessment is in placeX Student learning goals are well-articulatedX Assessment methods are clearly describedX Assessment methods are appropriately selectedX_ Assessment methods are well-implementedX_ Direct and indirect methods are implementedX_ Results are reportedX_ Results are tied to closing the loop. | No specific plan f Student learning g Assessment metho Assessment metho Assessment metho Asingle type of a No results are rep | for Improvement for assessment is in place. goals are not well-articulated. ods are not clearly described. ods are not appropriately selected. ods are not well-implemented. ssessment methods predominates. orted. early field to closing the loop. |

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Excellent example of an assessment report and follow-through on assessment planning. See comments under Methods and Results, above.

| MATERIALS | REVIEWED | | | |
|--------------|---|---------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| | al report ices (cited in annual report) (please describe) Assessmen | P | Assessment plan (as posted) revious assessment review MHS | |
| Reviewer(s): | Name Department Phone Number e-mail | | _Atmosph Sciences | |
| Section 1: | Y Section 2:Y | Section 3:Y Section | on 4:Y | |
| N NA | yes, this is done appropria no, this is not done at all, no information available action or progress is appa | or it is not done in relationsl | hip to student learning acking that this is completely and | l appropriately done |

| DEPARTMENT Pathology – Certificate in Clinica | al MicrobiologyDATE3/24/10 |
|---|---|
| COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REV | /IEWFred Remer, Joan Hawthorne |
| 1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS | |
| Were any goals referenced? If so, were goals well articulated? Do goals address student learning? Comments: | YES_X_ NO QUALIFIED Y/N YES_X_ NO QUALIFIED Y/N YES_X_ NO QUALIFIED Y/N |
| Goals are well-articulated and clear. | |
| (shown in alignment within parentheses). Use 'U' (undergrawhich are similar to the referenced departmental goals. yes1 Communication – written or oral ("able to write a2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "b3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning5 Information literacy ("be able to access and eval6 Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of diversing7 Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelong8 Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both for8) | the intellectually creative"; explore, discover, engage) ("apply empirical dataanalyze graphical information") uatefor effective, efficient, and ethical use") ity and use that understanding") ing learning") or their communities and for the world") If departmental goals with institutional and Essential Studies |
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced? If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach? | YES_XNOQUALIFIED Y/N YES_XNOQUALIFIED Y/N YES_XNOQUALIFIED Y/N |
| Comments: | |
| Each of the four goals was aligned with specific data source | es, including both direct and indirect sources. |
| work products in various classes, although the data to be an discrepancy. Although we recognize that nationally standar | ebsite) indicates that assessment information is to be collected from talyzed comes from the national exam – we were confused by this edized scores are a very good measure for a program like yours, we you're able to break down student scores by topic and see specific performance is weaker. |
| 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? If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? Were the results tied to goals for student learning? | YES_X_ NO YES_X_ NO YES_X NO | QUALIFIED Y/N |
|--|--|--|
| Comments: | | |
| National board scores were cited as "excellent" although this However, 100% of UND students passed the national boards. although example data were not included. E.g., "The categor reported that the students had increased their skills significant conclusions would make the report more readable to those out all data within the assessment report. | Reference was made to rical coordinator reviewe tly" Including a bit o | specific results in other areas as well, and the performance evaluations and finformation to support these |
| In addition to departmental goals, some assessment results ma 'U' (undergraduate) or 'G' (graduate) to identify those results achievement. For indicated items, please describe findings in _yes1 Communication – written or oral ("able to write ar2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (5 Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluated for the different of the different o | which are applicable to the appropriate section be and speak in various setting intellectually curious"; a e intellectually creative"; "apply empirical dataa atefor effective, efficient y and use that understand g learning") their communities and for the departmental, institution | institutional/Essential Studies goal below gs with a sense of purpose/audience") analyze, synthesize, evaluate) explore, discover, engage) analyze graphical information") ent, and ethical use") ling") or the world") onal and Essential Studies goals: |
| 4. CLOSING THE LOOP | iewing inai siuaenis nave | г ининей сотрененсу. |
| Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported? • If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning? | YES_X NO YESX NO | QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N |
| Comments: | | |
| One example of a change involves adjusting the method of conassessment itself was inappropriate for their purposes. Howe practice on high level questions prior to the assessment itself. | ver, plans are also in the | works to provide students with more |
| SUMMARY | Arags | o for Improvement |
| Strengths _X A specific plan for assessment is in placeX Student learning goals are well-articulatedX Assessment methods are clearly describedX Assessment methods are appropriately selectedX_ Assessment methods are well-implementedX_ Direct and indirect methods are implementedX_ Results are reportedX_ Results are tied to closing the loop. | No specific plan f Student learning g Assessment metho Assessment metho Assessment metho Asingle type of a No results are rep | for Improvement for assessment is in place. goals are not well-articulated. ods are not clearly described. ods are not appropriately selected. ods are not well-implemented. ssessment methods predominates. orted. early field to closing the loop. |

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Excellent example of an assessment report and follow-through on assessment planning. See comments under Methods and Results, above.

| MATERIA | LS REVIEWED | | | |
|--------------|---|---------------------------------|---|------------------|
| | nual report ndices (cited in annual report) er (please describe) Assessmen | Pi | Assessment plan (as posted) revious assessment review MHS | |
| Reviewer(s) | | | _Atmosph Sciences | |
| Section 1: _ | Y Section 2:Y | Section 3:Y Section | on 4:Y | |
| N | yes, this is done appropria no, this is not done at all, no information available | or it is not done in relationsl | hip to student learning acking that this is completely and ap | propriately done |

| DEPARTMENT Pathology – Certificate in Clinical | ImmunohematologyDATE3/24/10 |
|---|---|
| COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVI | EWFred Remer, Joan Hawthorne |
| 1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS | |
| Were any goals referenced?If so, were goals well articulated?Do goals address student learning? | YES_X NO QUALIFIED Y/N YES_X_ NO QUALIFIED Y/N YES_X_ NO QUALIFIED Y/N |
| Comments: Goals are well-articulated and clear. | |
| (shown in alignment within parentheses). Use 'U' (undergrad which are similar to the referenced departmental goals. | e intellectually creative"; explore, discover, engage) "apply empirical dataanalyze graphical information") atefor effective, efficient, and ethical use") y and use that understanding") y learning") their communities and for the world") **Repartmental goals with institutional and Essential Studies** |
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced? If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach? | YES_X NO QUALIFIED Y/N YES_X NO QUALIFIED Y/N YES_X NO QUALIFIED Y/N |
| Comments: | |
| Each of the four goals was aligned with specific data sources, | including both direct and indirect sources. |
| work products in various classes, although the data to be anal discrepancy. Although we recognize that nationally standardi | esite) indicates that assessment information is to be collected from lyzed comes from the national exam – we were confused by this ized scores are a very good measure for a program like yours, we bu're able to break down student scores by topic and see specific performance is weaker. |
| 3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS | |
| Were any assessment results reported? | YES X NO OHALIFIED Y/N |

| If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? Were the results tied to goals for student learning? | | NO NO | |
|---|--|---|---|
| Comments: | | | |
| National board scores were cited as "excellent" although this. However, 100% of UND students passed the national boards, although example data were not included. E.g., "The categor reported that the students had increased their skills significant conclusions would make the report more readable to those out all data within the assessment report. | . Reference w rical coording utly" Incli | vas made to sp ator reviewed uding a bit of i | pecific results in other areas as well, the performance evaluations and information to support these |
| In addition to departmental goals, some assessment results ma 'U' (undergraduate) or 'G' (graduate) to identify those results achievement. For indicated items, please describe findings in _yes1 Communication – written or oral ("able to write at2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be3 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (5 Information literacy ("be able to access and evalu6 Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of diversit7 Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelong8 Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both for8 Comments regarding results and the application of results to8 | s which are ap the appropri nd speak in vi- e intellectually be intellectually "apply empiratefor effects y and use that g learning") | oplicable to in ate section be- arious settings y curious"; an- ly creative"; e- ical dataan- ctive, efficien- t understandin- nities and for | stitutional/Essential Studies goal low s with a sense of purpose/audience") alyze, synthesize, evaluate) explore, discover, engage) alyze graphical information") t, and ethical use") ng") the world") |
| Data regarding communication skills suggested to faculty rev | viewing that s | tudents have | "attained competency." |
| 4. CLOSING THE LOOP | | | |
| Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported? • If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning? | YESX_ YESX_ | NO | _ QUALIFIED Y/N _ QUALIFIED Y/N |
| Comments: | | | |
| One example of a change involves adjusting the method of coassessment itself was inappropriate for their purposes. Howe practice on high level questions prior to the assessment itself. | ever, plans ar | e also in the v | works to provide students with more |
| SUMMARY | | | |
| Strengths | | Areas f | for Improvement |
| X A specific plan for assessment is in placeX Student learning goals are well-articulatedX Assessment methods are clearly describedX Assessment methods are appropriately selectedX Assessment methods are well-implementedX Direct and indirect methods are implementedX Results are reportedX Results are field to closing the loop. | Stude: Asses: Asses: Asses: A sing No res | nt learning go sment method sment method sment method gle type of ass sults are repor | r assessment is in place. als are not well-articulated. Is are not clearly described. Is are not appropriately selected. Is are not well-implemented. It is sessment methods predominates. It it is a closing the loop. |

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Excellent example of an assessment report and follow-through on assessment planning. See comments on methods and data in sections above.

| MATERIALS | REVIEWED | | | |
|--------------|--|-------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| | al report ices (cited in annual report) (please describe) <i>Assessmer</i> | | Assessment plan (as posted) Previous assessment review SMHS | |
| Reviewer(s): | Name Department Phone Number e-mail | _Acad Affairs _7-4684 | _Fred Remer _Atmosph Sciences _7-4055 du _remer@aero.und.edu | |
| Section 1: | Y Section 2:Y | Section 3:Y Se | ction 4:Y | |
| N NA | yes, this is done appropri no, this is not done at all, no information available action or progress is appa | or it is not done in relation | onship to student learning is lacking that this is completely a | and appropriately done |

| DEPARTMENT Patho | ology – Categorical Certificat | e in Chemistr | yDATE_ | _3/24/10 |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| COMMITTEE MEMBE | R(S) CONDUCTING REVI | IEWFred | Remer, Jo | an Hawthorne |
| 1. STUDENT LEARNING | GOALS | | | |
| • Do goals addres Comments: | s well articulated? ss student learning? | YES_X_ | NO | QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N |
| Goals are well-articulated an | ed clear. | | | |
| (shown in alignment within p which are similar to the reference which are similar to the reference with the | parentheses). Use 'U' (undergrade enced departmental goals. written or oral ("able to write assoning – critical thinking (or "besoning – creative thinking (or "besoning – quantitative reasoning (acy ("be able to access and evaluinstrate understanding of diversit ("commit themselves to lifelong ip ("share responsibility both for mental goals and alignment of all is addressed within expected leads of the committee of the committe | duate) or 'G' (g and speak in var intellectually of e intellectually "apply empiricatefor effection y and use that use g learning") their communicate | raduate) to it ious settings curious"; ana creative"; en al dataana tive, efficient understandin ities and for it | xplore, discover, engage) ulyze graphical information") , and ethical use") g") the world") stitutional and Essential Studies |
| methods approp goals? • Were both directions are supported to the direction of the support of t | ifically chosen assessment briately aligned with individual ct and indirect assessment is components of a "multiple" | YES_X | NO | QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N |
| Comments: | | | | |
| Each of the four goals was al | igned with specific data sources | , including both | h direct and | indirect sources. |
| work products in various class discrepancy. Although we re hope that the exam results ar | sses, although the data to be ana cognize that nationally standard | lyzed comes fro lized scores are ou're able to br | om the nation a very good reak down st | nent information is to be collected from nal exam – we were confused by this I measure for a program like yours, we udent scores by topic and see specific |
| 3. ASSESSMENT RESULT | ГS | | | |
| 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? If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? Were the results tied to goals for student | | NO | - |
|--|---|---|--|
| learning? | YES_X | NO | QUALIFIED Y/N |
| Comments: | | | |
| National board scores were cited as "excellent" although this However, 100% of UND students passed the national boards. although example data were not included. E.g., "The categor reported that the students had increased their skills significant conclusions would make the report more readable to those out all data within the assessment report. | Reference w rical coordina utly" Inclu | as made to spo tor reviewed t ding a bit of ir | ecific results in other areas as well, the performance evaluations and nformation to support these |
| In addition to departmental goals, some assessment results ma 'U' (undergraduate) or 'G' (graduate) to identify those results achievement. For indicated items, please describe findings in _yes1 Communication – written or oral ("able to write at 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be 4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (5 Information literacy ("be able to access and evalu 6 Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of diversit 7 Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelong 8 Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both for | which are ap the appropria and speak in va- intellectually e intellectuall; "apply empiri atefor effect y and use that g learning") | plicable to ins the section belourious settings curious"; ana y creative"; exical dataana etive, efficient, cunderstanding | titutional/Essential Studies goal ow with a sense of purpose/audience") lyze, synthesize, evaluate) splore, discover, engage) lyze graphical information") , and ethical use") g") the world") |
| Comments regarding results and the application of results to | o departmenta | ıl, institutiona | al and Essential Studies goals: |
| Data regarding communication skills suggested to faculty rev | riewing that st | udents have " | attained competency." |
| 4. CLOSING THE LOOP | | | |
| Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported? • If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning? | YESX YESX_ | NO | QUALIFIED Y/N |
| Comments: | | | |
| One example of a change is adding study of body fluids to ensuring urinalysis. Another change involves adjusting the method of assessment itself was inappropriate for their purposes. Howe practice on high level questions prior to the assessment itself. | competency te ever, plans are | esting (for goa e also in the w | l #2) given that faculty felt the orks to provide students with more |
| SUMMARY | | | |
| Strengths | | Areas fo | or Improvement |
| _X A specific plan for assessment is in placeX Student learning goals are well-articulatedX Assessment methods are clearly describedX Assessment methods are appropriately selectedX_ Assessment methods are well-implementedX_ Direct and indirect methods are implementedX_ Results are reported. | Studen Assess Assess Assess Assess Asing | at learning goa ment methods ment methods ment methods | assessment is in place. als are not well-articulated. s are not clearly described. s are not appropriately selected. s are not well-implemented. essment methods predominates. |

| | tied to closing the loop. asking is tied to evidence. | | Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.) | ı |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|------|
| OVERALL SU | MMARY AND RECO | OMMENDATIONS: | | |
| Excellent example Results, above. | e of an assessment report | and follow-through on a | ssessment planning. See comments under Methods | and |
| MATERIALS R | EVIEWED | | | |
| | eport s (cited in annual report) ease describe) <i>Assessmer</i> | | K Assessment plan (as posted) _ Previous assessment review e SMHS | |
| | Name | _Joan Hawthorne_ | _Fred Remer | |
| | Department Phone Number | _Acad Affairs | _Atmosph Sciences | |
| | e-mail | | edu _remer@aero.und.edu | |
| Coding Key: Y = N = NA = | no information available | ately and well or it is not done in relati | ection 4:Y onship to student learning is lacking that this is completely and appropriately | done |

| DEPARTM | IENT | _Pathology – Clinical Lab Scien | ce | DATI | E 3/24/10 | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|------|
| COMMITT | ГЕЕ МЕ | MBER(S) CONDUCTING RE | E VIEW Fre | d Remer, Jo | oan Hawthorne | |
| 1. STUDEN | T LEAR | NING GOALS | | | | |
| • | If so, wer | y goals referenced? re goals well articulated? address student learning? | YES_X_ | NO | QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N | |
| Comments: Goals are bro are very clea | | re further broken down into very sp l-articulated. | ecific objectives v | which identify | y concrete learning outcomes. Th | ese |
| (shown in ali which are sinYes1 C2 T3 T4 T5 II6 D7 L8 S | gnment will gnill | artmental goals, please also consider within parentheses). Use 'U' (undergoute referenced departmental goals. Cation – written or oral ("able to written departmental goals. Cation – written or oral ("able to written departmental goals. Cation – written or oral ("able to written departmental goals thinking (or and reasoning – creative thinking (or and reasoning – quantitative reasoning in literacy ("be able to access and evidemonstrate understanding of diversaring ("commit themselves to lifely izenship ("share responsibility both departmental goals and alignment for goal is addressed within expected ETHODS | graduate) or 'G' (gete and speak in va "be intellectually r "be intellectually ng ("apply empirical valuatefor effect ersity and use that long learning") for their communator departmental geter | graduate) to identious settings curious"; analy creative"; excal dataanaltive, efficient understandinalties and for a goals with instantions | s with a sense of purpose/audience alyze, synthesize, evaluate) xplore, discover, engage) alyze graphical information") t, and ethical use") the world") the world") | oals |
| • | If so, wer methods a goals? Were bot methods | essment methods referenced? re specifically chosen assessment appropriately aligned with individual theorem and indirect assessment used as components of a "multiple" approach? | al YESX | NO | QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N | |
| | | ls were identified and the departmen vas clear and it was easy to make se | | | als are addressed through the var | ious |
| 3. ASSESSN | MENT RI | ESULTS | | | | |
| • | If so, wer | results reported? re the results clear in terms of how difically affirm achievement of goals | | NO | | |

| OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATI | ONS: |
|---|--|
| X A specific plan for assessment is in placeX Student learning goals are well-articulatedX Assessment methods are clearly describedX Assessment methods are appropriately selectedX Assessment methods are well-implementedX Direct and indirect methods are implementedX Results are reportedX Results are tied to closing the loop (Decision-making is tied to evidence.) | 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.) |
| Strengths | Areas for Improvement |
| SUMMARY | |
| | aching), teaching practice (e.g., providing students with more (e.g., restructuring an assessment) are being made based on the |
| results reported? • If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning? | YES_X NO QUALIFIED Y/N YES_X NO QUALIFIED Y/N |
| Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment | |
| 4. CLOSING THE LOOP | |
| Review of evaluation written by clinical instructors demonst | trated satisfactory achievement of the Communication outcome. |
| Comments regarding results and the application of results | to departmental, institutional and Essential Studies goals: |
| 'U' (undergraduate) or 'G' (graduate) to identify those result achievement. For indicated items, please describe findings in | and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience") be intellectually curious"; analyze, synthesize, evaluate) be intellectually creative"; explore, discover, engage) ("apply empirical dataanalyze graphical information") luatefor effective, efficient, and ethical use") bity and use that understanding") ng learning") |
| indirect evidence for goal #2 had a very low return rate and specific exams related to the goal) showed a disappointing l that the assessment instrument was problematic and would be | dence demonstrating student learning of goal #1. One source of a was therefore not relevant, but a direct source (evaluation of level of achievement. However, upon discussion, faculty concluded be revised for the next year. No specific evidence is cited for goal ent work and concrete data could, therefore, be provided. Clinica goal #4, and learning was satisfactory. |

YES_X_ NO___ QUALIFIED Y/N ____

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

learning?

If this year's report is typical, faculty in the Clinical Lab Science program are providing an outstanding example of how to do assessment thoughtfully and meaningfully – and yet not create an undue degree of burden or extraneous paperwork. Although the report is short, it is extremely clear and on point.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

| | ces (cited in annual report) | X Assessment plan (as posted) Previous assessment review omitted to the medical school |
|--------------|--|---|
| Reviewer(s): | Name Department Phone Number e-mail | _Joan HawthorneFred Remer |
| Section 1:Y | Section 2:Y | Section 3:Y Section 4:Y |
| N = NA = | = no information available | ately and well or it is not done in relationship to student learning arent: however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately do |

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2008-09 Annual Reports <u>GRADUATE PROGRAMS</u>

DEPARTMENT Pathology - Clinical Laboratory Science DATE 3/21/10

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Fred Remer / Joan Hawthorne

| 1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|----|---|--|--|--|--|
| Were any goals referenced?If so, were goals well articulated?Do goals address student learning? | YES_X_ YES_X_ YES_X_ | | QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | |
| The Department of Pathology Annual Report for the Masters of Science in Clinical Laboratory Science Program (2008-2009) lists four learning goals and two assessment goals. Each learning goal is addressed by specific learning objectives that describe expected student behavior. The learning objectives are student-centered and specifically address cognitive, skill and subject matter dimensions. | | | | | | | |
| 2. ASSESSMENT METHODS | | | | | | | |
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced? If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual | YES_X_ | NO | QUALIFIED Y/N | | | | |
| goals? | YES_X | NO | QUALIFIED Y/N | | | | |
| Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach? | YES_X | NO | QUALIFIED Y/N | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | |
| The Department of Pathology Plan for Assessing Student Leamethods for each student learning objective. The measures in methods are varied and appropriate. | | | | | | | |
| 3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS | | | | | | | |
| Were any assessment results reported? • If so, were the results clear in terms of how | YES_X_ | NO | QUALIFIED Y/N | | | | |
| they specifically affirm achievement of goals? | YES | NO | QUALIFIED Y/NX | | | | |
| they indicate need for improvement? | YES | NO | QUALIFIED Y/N _X_ | | | | |
| Were the results tied to goals for student learning? | YES | NO | QUALIFIED Y/NX | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | |
| Appropriate methods were used to assess each goal, although there was no explicit mention of the results of the final comprehensive exam in assessing Goal 3 or other direct assessments. A summary of the assessment results was included for each goal, but the nature of data and findings were unclear. Strengths and weaknesses were identified in meeting each goal. Indirect assessment methods (such as student feedback) were put to good use, but more detail on the direct assessment results of student learning is desired (including example data or a brief description of analysis, e.g., "using a rubric"). | | | | | | | |
| 4. CLOSING THE LOOP Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results rep | oorted? YE | SX | NO QUALIFIED Y/N | | | | |

| | If so, do curricular or other in changes arising from assessin directly address goals for stud | ent results | YESX | _ NO | QUALIFIED Y/N | |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|----|
| Comments: | | | | | | |
| Specifically, deemed succestudents and the However, all | the assessment affirmed the sessful in meeting Goal 1. Stufaculty agreed that CLS 509 to fithe changes made seem to | uccess of on-line ser dent feedback in CL needed to change to a stem from indirect a | minar in meetin S 501 indicated meet Goal 3. S assessment find | g Goal 1. I a need fouggestion ings – and | made to address the weaknesses. Changes to CLS 591 and 997 were or improvement in meeting Goal 2. Both as were made to better meet Goal 4. If it would be interesting to see if direct if available, could add clarity. | |
| SUMMARY | | | | Amana | for Immovement | |
| | Strengths | | | Areas | for Improvement | |
| XStuden XAssess XAssess State = Direct : Results XResults | cific plan for assessment is in that learning goals are well-artic ment methods are clearly desiment methods are appropriat ment methods are well-imple and indirect methods are imple are reported. It is are tied to closing the loop. | culated. scribed. ely selected. mented. lemented. | Student lands Assessment Assessme | earning go ent metho- ent metho- ent metho- type of as s are repo re not clea | or assessment is in place. coals are not well-articulated. ds are not clearly described. ds are not appropriately selected. ds are not well-implemented. sessment methods predominates. orted. arly tied to closing the loop. is not directly tied to evidence.) | |
| OVERALL | SUMMARY AND REC | OMMENDATION | NS: | | | |
| formulated ar changes to the indicate chan useful, it can both indirect would definit | nd appropriate. Assessment recurriculum. While direct as ges in student learning due to be difficult to tease out the diand direct assessment data ar | nethods are appropri- sessment methods we the lack of detail in ifference between sate being collected and tail on findings from | ate and varied. vere included in the assessment tisfaction and a d used. Overall (and use of fin | The result the assess results. A ctual learn, a very will dings from | t learning goals and objectives are well lts of the assessment were used to make ssment plan, it is difficult to tell if they Although indirect assessment is undeniably ning, and thus our concern about ensuring well organized assessment effort, although is m) the direct assessment activities describe | it |
| MATERIAL | S REVIEWED | | | | | |
| X Annu | | | X Assess | | n (as posted) ment review | |
| Reviewer(s): | Name Department Phone Number e-mail | Fred Remer Atmospheric Scie 777-4055 remer@aero.und.e | ncesAca 777 edujoa | ademic Af '-4684 n.hawthor | ffairs rne@und.edu | |
| Section 1: | Y Section 2:Y | Section 3:Y | Section 4: _ | _Y | | |
| Coding Key: Y N NA | | , or it is not done in i | | | arning | |

| DEPARTN | MENTPathology – Cytotechnology Progr | ram | DATI | E3/24/10 |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| COMMIT | TEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVI | EW_Fred Re | emer, Joan I | Hawthorne |
| 1. STUDEN | VT LEARNING GOALS | | | |
| | Were any goals referenced? If so, were goals well articulated? Do goals address student learning? | YES_X_ YES YES_X_ | | QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N _X_ QUALIFIED Y/N |
| exam). Goal knowledge, c covered by th skills, etc.) to | orded to include both the learning outcome ("knowls #3 and 4 are clear and well-articulated. Goal and skills," without giving any indication of what his broad goal. Normally, we might expect that be one ensure that departmental faculty — and anyone on the of what those terms mean. | #2 is unclear i those might b earning goals | n that it refer e – although would descri | rs to "job entry competency, it seems likely that a lot of territory is ibe the intended learning (knowledge, |
| and posted o objectives. I the departme | nnology program also has a completely different in UND's website (pp. 24-25). These goals are mages and the assessment report, this does not appoint — although clarity regarding the differences be assessment plan would be helpful. | uch more spec ear to be the l | cific and are i | broken down into specific learning or the assessment plan) being used by |
| (shown in ali which are sinYes1 C2 T3 T5 I5 I | o the Departmental goals, please also consider Unignment within parentheses). Use 'U' (undergradmilar to the referenced departmental goals. Communication – written or oral ("able to write a Phinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be Phinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be Phinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluative Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of diversitation learning ("commit themselves to lifelong Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both for | duate) or 'G' (gend speak in valintellectually e intellectually "apply empiricate for effect y and use that g learning") | graduate) to i drious settings curious"; and driverer; escal dataand tive, efficient understanding | identify UND/Essential Studies goals s with a sense of purpose/audience") alyze, synthesize, evaluate) xplore, discover, engage) alyze graphical information") t, and ethical use") ag") |
| goals: It appears the assessment p | egarding departmental goals and alignment of a cat Communication is the only ES and institutional colan (which does not appear to be in use) does not felong learning. | ıl goal address | sed within the | e Cytotechnology program. The posted |
| 2. ASSESSI | MENT METHODS | | | |
| Were any spo | ecific assessment methods referenced? If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual | YES_X_ | NO | QUALIFIED Y/N |
| • | goals? Were both direct and indirect assessment | YES | NO | QUALIFIED Y/NX |
| • | methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach? | YES_X | NO | QUALIFIED Y/N |

Comments:

Although it appears that the certification exam is aligned with the goal about "knowledge" (goal #1) and possibly other goals as well, the extent of that alignment is not clear from the report (i.e., which goals, exactly, are addressed by that exam?). The report also does not explain how other assessment methods (e.g., graduate and employer surveys, assessment results from the clinical site, etc.) align with the four goals identified for the program.

The posted assessment plan indicates that review of student grades is a major assessment strategy, but it is worth noting that final grades rarely align directly with a specific program outcome and, in fact, many factors in addition to achievement of a particular outcome typically influence letter grades. For that reason, we would strongly suggest reviewing elements of students' graded work (e.g., reviewing questions or assignments which specifically address cytotechnology regulatory measures to see learning around goal #3 from the posted plan) rather than final letter grades.

| 3 | ٨ | CCEC | CA | /FNT | RESUL | TC |
|------|---|------|-------|------|-------|-----|
| J. 1 | 4 | OORG | ווכיו | | KESUL | 713 |

| 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? If so, were the results clear in terms of how | YES | NO | QUALIFIED Y/N _X_ | | | |
| they indicate need for improvement? | YES | NO | QUALIFIED Y/N _X_ | | | |
| Were the results tied to goals for student learning? | YES | NO | QUALIFIED Y/NX | | | |
| Comments: The pass rate and average scores from the national registry e (the report describes the pass rate as providing information a that it would be very difficult to differentiate learning related Although UND students had a 100% pass rate, their mean scot that mean score rise. | about goals # to the differe | 31, 2, and $3-6$ and $3-6$ | ulthough if this is the case, it appears d solely on the information reported). | | | |
| Entry level skills (goal #2) are evaluated "throughout the program" but details of findings and methods are not provided. Communication skills (and other traits) are evaluated during clinicals, and the report states that program graduates are "abt to meet the demands of the cytotechnology profession" – but no specific results are reported and it is difficult to be certain about the kinds of data which might support that conclusion. | | | | | | |
| Findings from indirect assessments (surveys) were reported in | n general ter | ms, as were co | onclusions of an advisory committee. | | | |
| In addition to departmental goals, some assessment results material (undergraduate) or 'G' (graduate) to identify those results achievement. For indicated items, please describe findings in1 Communication – written or oral ("able to write a2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be3 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (a5 Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluated —6 Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of diversity7 Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelong a Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both for | s which are a the appropried speak in verification in eintellectual eintellectual "apply empi atefor effecty and use that g learning") | pplicable to in iate section be various setting y curious"; an lly creative"; e rical dataan ective, efficien at understandin | astitutional/Essential Studies goal low Is with a sense of purpose/audience") alyze, synthesize, evaluate) explore, discover, engage) alyze graphical information") t, and ethical use") ng") | | | |
| Comments regarding results and the application of results to | o departmen | tal, institution | al and Essential Studies goals: | | | |
| No results related to these goals were provided. | | | | | | |
| 4. CLOSING THE LOOP | | | | | | |
| Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported? | YES | NO | QUALIFIED Y/N _X | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| c | f so, do curricular or other in changes arising from assessme lirectly address goals for stud | ent results | YES | _ NO_X_ QUAL | IFIED Y/N |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| Comments: | | | | | |
| | t faculty will "monitor sensiti pecific actions were not deem | | udditional Pa | thology course based | on their review of assessment |
| 5. SUMMAR | Y.Y | | | | |
| | Strengths | | | Areas for Impro | vement |
| Student leAssessmeAssessmeAssessmeX_Direct aX_ResultsResults an | ic plan for assessment is in plearning goals are well-articulart methods are clearly describent methods are appropriately ent methods are well-implement indirect methods are implant reported. The tied to closing the loop. The making is tied to evidence. | ated. ibed. selected. ented. emented. | Studer Assess Assess A sing No res X Resu | sment methods are not ele type of assessment sults are reported. alts are not clearly tied | ot well-articulated. clearly described. appropriately selected. well-implemented. methods predominates. |
| OVERALL | SUMMARY AND RECO | OMMENDATIO | NS: | | |
| materials revie about student down elements for example, to areas of learns be difficult to the And we reiterd normally requitechnical comp | o understand why student sco ing which are much weaker (make positive changes based ate our caution about using en ire a similar disaggregation (| rdized exam is undo but the meaning w n with various inter res were below the or stronger) than o on results. nd-of-term letter gr (how much of the g | oubtedly a cr rould be clea nded learning national ave ther areas? Y rades as a su rade indicate | itical and very informarer if it is possible (what outcomes. It seems to brage, e.g., are there specified that more fine bestitute for assessmenter regulatory knowledges. | ative source of information nich it may be??) to break hat it would be very importan pecific competencies and -grained information, it would tresults, since grades |
| MATERIALS | S REVIEWED | | | | |
| | al report dices (cited in annual report) (please describe) detailed as | ssessment reports s | Previ | sessment plan (as posto lous assessment review the college | |
| Reviewer(s): | Name Department Phone Number e-mail | _7-4684 | A 7. | tmosph Sciences | |
| Section 1:Y | Y Section 2:Y | Section 3:Y | 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