

**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**  
**Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in FY2012 Annual Reports**  
**GRADUATE PROGRAMS**

**DEPARTMENT** Physical Therapy **DATE** 04/21/13

**PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW** Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT)

**COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW** Deborah Worley, Mary K. Askim-Lovseth

**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:**

*There are five goals (each with measurable objectives) for DPT students listed in an assessment plan dated August 2005 (the most recent one posted). The goals are well articulated and address student learning:*

- *The student will demonstrate the skills necessary for the entry level practice of physical therapy.*
- *The student is an advocate for service to the community and the profession.*
- *The student will develop critical inquiry skills related to clinical and basic science research.*
- *The student will develop the skills required for life -long learning.*
- *The student is to be an advocate for health and wellness at the individual and societal levels, demonstrate respect for self and others, and a commitment to the profession of physical therapy.*

*The objectives address the development of specific competencies and skill sets, such as clinical skills, evaluation and diagnosis, principles of the scientific method, oral and written communication skills, critical thinking skills, professionalism, and patient/community advocacy.*

**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:**

*The 2005 assessment plan lists multiple assessment methods, direct and indirect. Examples include written and practical examinations, clinical experience evaluation, student surveys, employer surveys, patient surveys, and alumni surveys. The methods do appear to be aligned with learning goals. The FY2012 Annual Report reports assessment methods that address the first learning goal only (“The student will demonstrate the skills necessary for the entry level practice of physical therapy”) and corresponding objectives. Specific methods refer to use of National Physical Therapy Examination (NPTE) ratings and scores, Clinical Performance Instrument (CPI) ratings and narratives, practitioner interview data, and review of student transcripts and admission data.*

**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>X</u> | NO <u>  </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>  </u> |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?            | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>  </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>  </u> |
| • Were the results tied to goals for student learning?   | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>  </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>  </u> |

**Comments:**

The FY2012 annual report included assessment data that correspond to the four methods described to assess the first learning goal. For example, the report includes NPTE first-time pass rates over time (e.g., 78% in 2010; 84% in 2011; 96% in 2012). CPI mean scores indicate “readiness for entry level practice”. The individual scores below the mean were addressed with students one-on-one, as were narrative comments that focused on individual student performance. The Department indicated that they worked with clinical site supervisors and instructors to address competencies or skills areas where student ratings showed deficiencies.

A summary of practitioner interview comments on students’ skill levels and mastery of competencies: “Consistently, across groups, students’ communication skills are good and the clinicians enjoy working with UND-PT students. The students’ knowledge base seems appropriate. The students do have difficulty with basic level skills, the integration of simultaneous and multiple needs of the complex patient/client, and the progression of a long term plan of care for individuals with prolonged recoveries.”

Finally, the annual report included a summary of the transcript and admission data review. Findings included an increase in the number of courses taken to replace a ‘C’ or ‘B’ with a higher grade as well as a note that some students chose to complete some courses (original or replacement) at other institutions.

**4. CLOSING THE LOOP**

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

YES X NO    QUALIFIED Y/N   

- If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?

YES X NO    QUALIFIED Y/N   

**Comments:**

The FY2012 annual report included mention of using assessment results to make changes to the program, changes to courses, and changes to admissions criteria. For example, the department modified course content and course sequencing, formed a curriculum committee, purchased e-curriculum software, added weekly review sessions for students in Fall Year 3, integrated a mandatory practice examination and assessment tool (PEAT) for Year 3 students, added an on-campus review course to prepare students for the exam, formed an advisory committee, added a clinical experience for Year 1 students, and adjusted the Department policy on the number of replacement grades that will be allowed in calculating semester and cumulative GPAs. The Department also started using the Physical Therapy Centralized Application Service (PTCAS) on July 1, 2012 to assist in applicant management.

**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.
- X Assessment methods are well-implemented.
- X Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
- X Results are reported.
- X 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:**

As previously stated, the most recent Departmental Plan for Assessment of Student Learning for the DPT program is dated August 2005. Student learning goals (and objectives), assessment methods, assessment data, and information on closing the loop are referenced in the FY2012 Annual Report, with a note that indicates the assessment information in the annual report is an addition to the currently posted plan. The Department is encouraged to upload the revised DPT assessment plan as soon as possible.

*The DPT program is to be commended for maintaining well-articulated goals and objectives that are focused on student learning. The stated assessment methods are aligned with the learning goals. The FY2012 annual report includes specific assessment results for goal one; it is recommended that the Department consider adding assessment data that align with the other student learning goals. Finally, there is an emphasis on using assessment data to make decisions related to the program. Thus, "closing the loop" was significantly achieved in a relevant and comprehensive manner; the Department's work in this area is truly exemplary.*

**MATERIALS REVIEWED**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Annual report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment plan (as posted)
<input type="checkbox"/> Appendices (cited in annual report)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Previous assessment review
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe)	

Reviewer(s):	Name	Mary K. Askim-Lovseth	Deborah Worley
	Department	Marketing	Educational Leadership
	Phone Number	777-2930	777-3140
	e-mail	<a href="mailto:maskim@business.und.edu">maskim@business.und.edu</a>	<a href="mailto:deborah.worley@und.edu">deborah.worley@und.edu</a>

Section 1: ☐ Y ☐ N    Section 2: ☐ Y ☐ N    Section 3: ☐ Y ☐ N    Section 4: ☐ Y ☐ N

**Coding Key:**

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected in other years)
- 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

Revision 10/11/12