DEPARTMENT__Family/Community Medicine – PA Program__DATE__4/19/2010_____
COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW____Perkins/Hawthorne_____

### 1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- Were any goals referenced?             YES_x___    NO____    QUALIFIED Y/N ___
- If so, were goals well articulated?      YES_x__     NO____    QUALIFIED Y/N ___
- Do goals address student learning?    YES_x___    NO____    QUALIFIED Y/N ___

*Comments:* **Goals are well described and appropriate**

### 2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

Were any specific assessment methods referenced?      YES_x___    NO____    QUALIFIED Y/N ____

- If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals?      YES_____    NO____    QUALIFIED Y/N _x___
- Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach?      YES_____    NO____    QUALIFIED Y/N _x___

*Comments:*  The program appears to do a good job of evaluating progress and achievements of individual students, but does not pay as much attention to assessing learning related to particular goals across the program overall.

It would be valuable if department faculty would address the bulleted goals listed on the first page of their report one-by-one and explain/evaluate whether <u>the program</u> is succeeding in these areas.  This may require additional data be gathered but can, in part, be done using what's already been collected.  We suggest creating a table that lists goals in one column, methods of assessment that go with each, etc.  A template available on UND's assessment website can be used if you'd find that helpful.

### 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____    NO____    QUALIFIED Y/N __x__
- If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?      YES____    NO____    QUALIFIED Y/N __x_
- Were the results tied to goals for student learning?      YES____    NO____    QUALIFIED Y/N __x__

*Comments:*

There is good discussion of student evaluation, but little discussion of program assessment.  The only metric that directly assesses the program is the number of students that successfully pass the national board exams.  Training students to pass the exams, however, is not one of the goals listed on the first page.  Metrics need to be identified for the goals, and exam scores might be taken apart so that portions of the score could be used to look at student learning related to program goals.  It would be well worth examining (and reporting) how students do on exam items specifically related to the various learning they are expected to achieve (e.g., looking at assessment of emergency needs vs. providing evidence-based health care – are students doing great on both?  Or maybe better on one area than the other?)

It would also be helpful if the student data collected were summarized – providing statistics that reveal how many students succeed at achieving each goal, etc.

The key thing is to evaluate whether the program is successful by looking at student learning outcomes (across students generally), to identify changes that will make it more successful, and then to come back in subsequent years to see if the changes led to the desired outcomes.

## 4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment
results reported?                                              YES_____   NO____   QUALIFIED Y/N __x__

- If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?    YES_____   NO__x__   QUALIFIED Y/N ____

*Comments:*

Some changes are listed on the last two pages of the report but it is unclear how they relate to the assessment results. The changes do not directly address the learning goals. So while these changes may well be helpful, we can't tell if or how they relate to the goals set for student learning or information collected about students progress toward those goals.

## SUMMARY

| *Strengths* | *Areas for Improvement* |
|---|---|
| _____ A specific plan for assessment is in place. | __x__ No specific plan for program assessment is in place. |
| __x__ Student learning goals are well-articulated. | _____ Student learning goals are not well-articulated. |
| __x__ Assessment methods are clearly described. | _____ Assessment methods are not clearly described. |
| _____ Assessment methods are appropriately selected. | __x__ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected. |
| _____ Assessment methods are well-implemented. | __?__ Assessment methods are not well-implemented. |
| _____ Direct and indirect methods are implemented. | _____ A single type of assessment methods predominates. |
| _____ Results are reported. | ___x_ No results are reported. |
| _____ Results are tied to closing the loop. | ___x_ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop. |
| (Decision-making is tied to evidence.) | (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.) |

## OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The report that was submitted does not say whether the overall program is successfully meeting the program goals or not. Faculty should rework some of the data they collect so that they can evaluate whether the program is meeting its goals, citing supporting evidence. Just aggregating data for all students would be a good way to start and may ultimately be adequate – if currently available information allows you to see how each student achieves each of the various goals (in which case, adding it up would tell you how students OVERALL are achieving the goals). Aggregating in this way would be quite interesting in that it would provide you with a concrete way to see which goals are very well achieved and which are achieved at a much lower level. Such information would be far more revealing than looking at pass rates or other general information which may tell you that students are GENERALLY learning but without showing what they're learning really well vs. areas of comparative weakness. With the across-student information, you'd be positioned to consider changes that, if needed, could lead to improvements.

## MATERIALS REVIEWED

| | |
|---|---|
| __x___ Annual report | __x___ Assessment plan (as posted) |
| _____ Appendices (cited in annual report) | _____ Previous assessment review |
| _____ Other (please describe) | |

Reviewer(s):     Name                      _D. Perkins_____   ___J. Hawthorne_       _____
                        Department            _Geology_____   ___Academic Affairs   _____
                        Phone Number     _2991_____   ___4684_____   _____
                        e-mail                _dexter.perkins@und.edu___joan.hawthorne@und.edu_____

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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