UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

DEPARTM	MENTPathology,			DATE2/25/13_	_
PROGRAM	M(S) COVERED IN REVIEW	_ Certificate in Hist	ology		_
COMMIT	TEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING	G REVIEW_Mary	K. Askim-L	ovseth, Deborah Worley	_
1. STUDEN	NT LEARNING GOALS				
•	Were any goals referenced? If so, were goals well articulated? Do goals address student learning?	YES <i>X</i> _	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N	
Comments:					
and certificate Plan that is p	nent of Pathology has an Assessment Plates. The Certificate in Histology is one coosted on the University website is dated am (Dr. Ruth Paur, phone conversation,	of two certificates offe l 2005-06. The Depart	red by the De	epartment. The most recent Ass	essment
learning goal three student exception of t improvement	ncing the Assessment Plan and the Annuals and objectives. Comments relate to the learning goals with each having respective that would be difficult to measure, to for example, would be to change Objected patient confidentiality."	hose noted in the annutive objectives. All ob Objectives 3.2 and 3.3	al report as t jectives repro . Both relate	hey are the most recent. There is esent distinct outcomes with the to value statements. A suggest	are tion for
Program goa	als are also included that specifically rel	late to faculty and the	assessment p	rocess.	
(shown in aliX1 CX2 T3 T4 T5 Ii6 DX7 I	o the Departmental goals, please also conignment within parentheses) and identify Communication – written or oral ("able to Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning in the property of the same of the property of the same of the property of the same of the property of the p	which goals are simil to write and speak in v ag (or "be intellectually ing (or "be intellectually asoning ("apply empir and evaluatefor effect f diversity and use that to lifelong learning")	lar to departmarious setting v curious"; ar y creative"; e ical dataan ctive, efficien t understanding	nental goals. gs with a sense of purpose/audic alyze, synthesize, evaluate) explore, discover, engage) alyze graphical information") t, and ethical use") ng")	
Comments regoals:	egarding departmental goals and align	ment of departmental	goals with in	stitutional and Essential Studi	es
Objective 3.1 Objective 2.2	lent learning objectives that relate to UN l, Practice good interpersonal communi 2, Evaluate discrepancies/problems that 2,Value continuing education for mainte	cation skills with peers can affect procedures	s, laboratory and results a	personnel, and faculty. (Goal and take appropriate action. (G	
2. ASSESSN	MENT METHODS				
	ecific assessment methods referenced? If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with independent of the control of the contr	ent	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N	

Final May 2013

	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
Comments:					
graduate and no comment.	ndirect measures were listed in the Annual Report d employer surveys, Board of Certification results s regarding the specifics of each but it was noted the clinical sites also provide feedback on the en	and in how the	put froi ey align	m the Progra	m Advisory Committee." There were
	ent Plan referenced generic terms, "evaluation o itional notations regarding what these entailed.	f studer	ıt perfo	rmance" and	l "performance evaluations." There
3. ASSESS	MENT RESULTS				
•	sessment 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_		NO	QUALIFIED Y/N _X_
		YES_		NO	QUALIFIED Y/N _X_
•		YES_		NO	QUALIFIED Y/N X
Comments:					
conversation	n had an 80 percent pass rate on the last national n, 2/26/13) UND pass rate was 100 percent. For a al mean of 481. Though the results of the exam a petencies.	the four	that re	ecently passe	d, their mean score was 681 compared
progressing staining, acc	lata were reported for the slides used to evaluate in their skills each semester. Data were collected essing, instrumentation, etc." but again, no speci communication, quality control, and the attitudes of	l regara fic data	ding "so were n	afety, specim noted. The c	en processing, embedding, microtomy, linical sites also assessed team skills,
Survey data	confirmed the program met the entry level expect	ations o	of the gr	raduate and	the employer.
Indicate any1 (2 73 74 75 16 17 1	o departmental goals, some assessment results may goals for which the department presents findings Communication – written or oral ("able to write as Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluative communications) ("demonstrate understanding of diversity ("demonstrate understanding of diversity ("iteliong learning ("commit themselves to lifelong Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both for	, and, for and speat intelled intelled apply atefo y and us	or indick in varectually extually empirically reffects see that any ")	ated items, d rious settings curious"; and creative"; exal dataana ive, efficient understandin	escribe findings below s with a sense of purpose/audience") lyze, synthesize, evaluate) splore, discover, engage) lyze graphical information") , and ethical use") g")

Comments regarding results and the application of results to departmental, institutional and Essential Studies goals:

Other than the aggregate information on the passage rate of the national certification exam, there were no results reported that would enable one to directly link to these goals.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?		YES	NO X	_ QUALIFIED Y/N	Y/N		
•	If so, do curricular or othe changes arising from asse directly address goals for	ssment results	YES		QUALIFIED Y/N _		
Comments:							
	feedback is provided to sturuction. The program is al		ubmissions, bu	t nothing is n	oted where improvemen	ıts need to be	
SUMMARY					C 7		
	Strengths			Areas	for Improvement		
_X_Student	ific plan for assessment is a learning goals are well-arment methods are clearly doment methods are appropriate ment methods are well-impand indirect methods are in are reported. are tied to closing the loop con-making is tied to evide the control of the contr	ticulated. escribed. ately selected. lemented. aplemented. c. ace.) ECOMMENDATI arrevising the Assessa bave better categori specific expectations	Studer _X_ Assess _Assess _Assess _No res _Result (Decis ONS: ment Plan for O zation. We sug would be (e.g.	nt learning go sment method sment method sment method gle type of ass sults are reports are not clear sion-making in Certificate in ggest better da , rubrics used	arly tied to closing the less not directly tied to ever the directly t	ated. ibed. selected. ented. ominates. oop. idence.) t that the goals ment measures	
X Annu				essment plan			
Appendices (cited in annual report)X Other (please describe)			X Previous assessment review				
	ne conversation with Dr. Ri	ıth Paur, Departmen	t of Pathology,	2/26/13)			
Reviewer(s)	Name Department Phone Number e-mail	Mary K. Askim Marketing 777-2930 <u>maskim@busin</u>		Educar 777-31	ah Worley tional Leadership 40 th.worley@und.edu		
Section 1:							
Coding Key: Y N NA ?	yes, this is done apprthat assessment is a cyclno, this is not done at	ical process, i.e., with all, or it is not done and	h additional ki in relationship	nds of data to to student lea	be collected in other yarning	ears)	