

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2015-16 (Academic year)

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Sports Medicine **DATE** April 12, 2016

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW B.S. in Athletic Training

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Casey Ozaki & Surojit Gupta

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:

Seven distinct learning goals are well articulated. They are collapsed into an overarching learning goal for which the educational experiences and assessment methods are described. One suggestion in order to provide specificity for each learning goal would be to instead provide the educational experiences and assessment methods specific to each learning goals. Updates to the assessment plan has been attached as an addendum for the last two reviews, it may be worth revising the assessment plan during the next 3-year review.

In addition to the program goals, please also consider UND's institutional and Essential Studies goals for student learning (shown in alignment within parentheses) and identify which goals are similar to program goals.

- X 1 Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”)
 X 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)
 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage)
 4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”)
 5 Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”)
 6 Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”)
 7 Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)
 8 Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)

Comments regarding program goals and alignment with institutional and Essential Studies goals:

There is no specific alignment between the program learning goals and the ES goals. In addition to aligning the individual learning goals with specific educational and assessment experiences, they would benefit from being paired with institutional and ES goals as appropriate.

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> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</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:

A variety of assessment methods are described and reflect both indirect and direct approaches. As described previously, the assessment methods are convened under one overarching learning goal and not specific to any of the seven learning goals. This could be addressed in future revisions. In addition, some of the methods could benefit from additional description. For

example, how are “Clinical Competency Assessments” evaluated? Are they assessed through coursework or clinical experiences? And how are the goals determined through the “Student-Preceptor Agreement” assessed?

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES___	NO___	QUALIFIED Y/N ___X___
• 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___X___	QUALIFIED Y/N ___

Comments:

Assessments were conducted through six methods this year: clinical experiences, clinical competency assessment, student-preceptor agreement, one-minute preceptor, senior presentation, and PxDx by E*Value. The program reported that the assessments were conducted, many of which as part of ongoing procedures or work, but no empirical data was included and limited information about the results were provided. For example, for the “student-preceptor agreement” the program indicated that data across students were collected and analyzed and it was determined that the process is an improvement for the students, but it is unclear what the goal for the assessment was or how the process was improved. Given that PxDx is a newer assessment method for the program, this might be an area for which results and data could be shared in a subsequent review.

In addition to program goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. Indicate any goals for which the program presents findings, and, for indicated items, describe findings below.

- _____ 1 Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”)
- _____ 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)
- _____ 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage)
- _____ 4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”)
- _____ 5 Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”)
- _____ 6 Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”)
- _____ 7 Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)
- _____ 8 Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)

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

The results did not address institutional or ES goals.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken?	YES___X___	NO___	QUALIFIED Y/N ___
• If so, were they based on assessment results?	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___	QUALIFIED Y/N ___X___

Comments:

The program described an effort to have athletic training courses adopt active learning formats and evidence-based practice at the encouragement of their accrediting agency. Although no data was provided, they state that transformations for select courses from 2013-15 were successful and that the assessment committee is encouraging more instructors to adopt such methods; five courses being converted were listed. Furthermore, a description of the PxDx data analysis indicated that as a result of the analysis the “clinical coordinator will intervene early each semester to first determine if a particular clinical experience is meeting the student’s needs then facilitate more accurate recording.” These loop-closing activities are described but not explicitly tied to specific goals or directly address goals for student learning.

SUMMARY

Strengths

- ☐ A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ☒ Student learning goals are well-articulated.
- ☐ Assessment methods are clearly described.
- ☐ 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:

It is clear through annual review that assessment is being implemented, analyzed, and considered in decision-making. The assessment plan describes clear individual learning goals and assessment methods. Alignment of individual goals with assessment methods would improve the plan and reporting for assessment reviews. In future reviews, more inclusion of some data and tying the data to specific learning goals and changes would help the program to clearly demonstrate the work that they already appear to be doing.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

- ☒ Annual assessment report
- ☒ Annual Report
- ☒ Assessment plan (as posted)
- ☐ Previous assessment review
- ☐ Other (please describe)

Reviewer(s):	Name	Casey Ozaki	Surojit Gupta
	Department	Teaching & Learning	Mechanical Engineering
	Phone Number	7-4256	7-1632
	e-mail	Carolyn.ozaki@und.edu	surojit.gupta@und.edu

Section 1: ☒ Y Section 2: ☐ Q Section 3: ☐ Q Section 4: ☐ Q

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 and analyzed in other years)
- Q = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done
- N = no, it is unclear whether it was done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning

Revised Sept 13, 2015