<div align="center">

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in <u>2014-15</u> (Academic Year)

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

</div>

DEPARTMENT <u>Office of Medical Education</u>   **DATE** <u>4/29/2016</u>

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW <u>MD Program</u>

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW <u>Shari Nelson, Devon Hansen, Ken Flanagan</u>

1. **STUDENT LEARNING GOALS**
   - Were any goals referenced?   <u>X</u> Yes <u> </u> No <u> </u> Qualified Y/N
   - If so, were goals well-articulated?   <u>X</u> Yes <u> </u> No <u> </u> Qualified Y/N
   - Do goals address student learning?   <u>X</u> Yes <u> </u> No <u> </u> Qualified Y/N

Comments:

The Student Learning Goals as identified in the December 2011 Assessment Plan and the 2014/15 Assessment Plan are as follows:

1. *Students will become physicians who are self-directed, life-long learners.*
2. *Students will become physicians who understand the scientific basis of medicine and are capable of applying that knowledge in the practice of medicine.*
3. *Students will become physicians who are skilled in providing care to individual patients.*
4. *Students will become physicians who use effective interpersonal and communication skills with patients, families, and professional associates.*
5. *Students will become physicians who demonstrate a commitment to carrying out professional responsibilities, adherence to ethical principles, and sensitivity to a diverse population.*
6. *Students will become physicians whose actions demonstrate an awareness of and responsiveness to the larger context and system of health care and the ability to effectively call on system resources to provide optimal patient care.*

The assessment plan states that "student learning goals are articulated in accordance with stated AAMC and Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME) "domains" and "competencies".

Under each goal, there are more specific objectives and under each objective, measurable outcomes are identified. For example, under Goal 1, there are two objectives, including the first:

- *Objective 1.1: Students will acquire knowledge and learn skills to stay current with changes in medical practice. "Continued dependence upon science and technology learned during medical school will be insufficient.*
  - *Measurable Outcomes 1.1.1 (one of three): Graduates will demonstrate the ability to read, understand, and apply the results of scientific research.*

The goals, objectives, and measurable outcomes are specific, well-written, and measurable.

2. **ASSESSMENT METHODS**

Were any specific assessment methods referenced?   <u>X</u> Yes <u> </u> No <u> </u> Qualified Y/N

- If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods   <u>X</u> Yes <u> </u> No <u> </u> Qualified Y/N
  appropriately aligned with individual goals?

- Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach? __X__ Yes _____ No _____ Qualified Y/N

Comments:

The 2011 Assessment Plan clearly identifies assessment methods, both direct and indirect, under each of the six student learning goals. Methods include, but are not limited to, (1) Clinical Performance Rating, (2) Residency Program Director Surveys, (3) Assessment of student acquisition of critical analysis skills, (4) Review of student interview, (5) Patient case presentation to peers and (6) Self-Assessment. The assessment methods correspond and appear to be appropriately aligned with the goals. These methods are reported on in the current Assessment Plan.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported? __X__ Yes _____ No _____ Qualified Y/N

- If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? __X__ Yes _____ No _____ Qualified Y/N

- If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? __X__ Yes _____ No _____ Qualified Y/N

- Were the results tied to goals of student learning? __X__ Yes _____ No _____ Qualified Y/N

Comments:

Results are reported for the first five goals; the plan is clear in stating that information was not collected for Goal 6. In some cases, results were reported in narrative form, such as "The quality of personal medical oaths decreased…" Most of the results reported were based on assessment of the basic sciences and clinical science items (i.e. communication, clinical, self-assessment) using a 5 point Likert scale. It was reported that all items listed scored 4 or above on the scale. There is also a comparison between the 2013 and 2014 scores with acknowledgement of higher and lower scores in 2014. (Ex. "The clinical science lectures were also rated lower this year although content and delivery have not changed.)

It would be helpful to the outside reader to have an explanation of the Likert scores, as it is unclear what a 4 or 5 means. It is also unclear, in some classes, whether the results being reported are for indirect or direct methods, which goals are being assessed, and whether they are program evaluation vs. student learning. It is apparent, within the bigger picture, that student learning is being assessed, but a more specific description and alignment between the goal, the method, and the results would be helpful.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken? __X__ Yes _____ No _____ Qualified Y/N

- If so, were they based on assessment results? __X__ Yes _____ No _____ Qualified Y/N

- If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning? __X__ Yes _____ No _____ Qualified Y/N

Comments:

The 2011 Assessment identifies the Medical Curriculum Committee and the Office of Medical Education as the offices responsible for assessing student learning and evaluation. The plan indicates that annual reviews of blocks and clerkships are provided to the Dean, department chairs, and block/clerkship design team for identification of areas needing improvement. Changes are then implemented as a part of their continued improvement process. The follow through of this plan is apparent in the current Assessment report and examples of revisions to be made, based on assessment results, are clearly identified. For example, the plan for the next year includes, but is not limited to:

1. *Work with the Basic Science Block Design team and senior lecturers on finding ways to bring more coherent order and layout in the schedule ("tie up the basic science lectures together.")*
2. *Explore ways to address the issues of high student failures observed in Block I, 2014.*

There are also several observations of faculty taking student feedback into account as they review content and delivery.

SUMMARY

Strengths		*Areas for Improvement*
X	A specific plan for assessment is in place.	No specific plan for assessment is in place.
X	Student learning goals are well-articulated.	Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
	Assessment methods are clearly described.	Assessment methods are not clearly described.
X	Assessment methods are appropriately selected.	Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
	Assessment methods are well-implemented.	Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
X	Direct and indirect methods are implemented.	A single type of assessment methods predominates.
	Results are reported.	No results are reported.
X	Results are tied to closing the loop.	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:

It is clear that the Office of Medical Education is committed to assessment and to the continual improvement of its program as related to program evaluation and student learning. It has very well articulated goals, objectives, and measurable learning outcomes. Assessment is in place and is conducted on a regular basis. As mentioned in Section 3, in reporting the data, it would be beneficial to more closely align goals, methods, and results for a reader not familiar with the program.

MATERIALS REVIEWED
X   Annual assessment report
X   Assessment plan (as posted)
X   Previous assessment review
      Other (please describe)

Reviewers:	Name	Shari Nelson	Devon Hansen	Ken Flanagan
	Department	Student Academic Services	Geography	Social Work
	Phone Number	777-0562	777-4587	777-2669
	e-mail	shari.nelson@und.edu	devon.hansen@und.edu	kenneth.flanagan@und.edu

****

Section 1: _____Y_____ Section 2: _____Y_____ Section 3: _____Y_____ Section 4: _____Y_____

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)
    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

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT   School of Medicine & Health Sciences - Public Health   **DATE**   05-01-2016

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW   Master of Public Health

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW   Kenneth Flanagan, Shari Nelson, Devon Hansen

1. **STUDENT LEARNING GOALS**
   - Were any goals referenced?   X   Yes _____ No _____   Qualified Y/N _____
   - If so, were goals well-articulated?   X   Yes _____ No _____   Qualified Y/N _____
   - Do goals address student learning?   X   Yes _____ No _____   Qualified Y/N _____

Comments:
The master of public health is a relatively new graduate program accepting their first cohort of students in 2012. The program is now an applicant for accreditation by the Council on Education for Public Health and is a 42 credit hour program. The program has two specializations: Population Health Analytics and Health Management and Policy. The program is based on the main UND campus but will begin offering at satellite sites in Bismarck and Minot North Dakota and in Casper Wyoming. The program has a focus on addressing the health care needs of the Northern Plains region.

The identified goals and learning outcomes for students are provided below:

Goal 1: Education
Provide students with the skills, knowledge, and awareness necessary to support and ensure conditions that promote population health improvement in North Dakota, the Northern Plains, and beyond.
   1. Deliver a competency-based public health curriculum (12 core competencies, 5 specialized competencies for health management and policy and 5 specialized competencies for population health and analytics).
   2. Provide students with the support and resources necessary to ensure timely completion of requirements for graduation
   3. Ensure that graduates demonstrate mastery of basic knowledge and skills in the 5 core areas of public health
   4. Provide students with the skills necessary to succeed in a diverse public health workforce
   5. Provide students with opportunities to engage in interdisciplinary studies

Goal 2: Research
Conduct and disseminate research that supports health improvement in populations and communities.
   1. Conduct interdisciplinary population health research
   2. Conduct and apply collaborative population health research with community partners
   3. Involve MPH students in population health research and scholarly activities
   4. Obtain external funding for population health research
   5. Disseminate population health research findings to academic, professional, and community audiences

Goal 3: Service
Provide public health-related service to academic, professional and community organizations.
   1. Provide service to the public health profession
   2. Provide service to communities
   3. Provide service to the University
   4. Promote and sustain service to the program, profession, University, and community through the student Public Health Association (PHA)

The program have identified two other goals, however, these goals are geared towards the program management, rather than student learning outcomes.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

Were any specific assessment methods referenced?   __x__ Yes   ____ No   ____ Qualified Y/N

- If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals?   __x__ Yes   ____ No   ____ Qualified Y/N

- Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach?   __x__ Yes   ____ No   ____ Qualified Y/N

Comments:

Direct assessment methods include embedded measures to determine students' attainment of core competencies coupled with student self-assessment of their competency attainment as the indirect measure. The assessment plan does identify which courses in the curriculum have primary responsibility for measuring assigned competencies. However, the plan does not identify which learning experiences will be used to determine an understanding of competencies in these courses. Target thresholds have been established for these methods. The threshold for the faculty assessment of students' attainment of core competencies is that 80% of competencies have been met or exceeded. For the indirect method, the target is to have 80% of students score 3 or higher (out of 5) on each core competency at graduation on the student self-assessment.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?   __x__ Yes   ____ No   ____ Qualified Y/N

- If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals?   __x__ Yes   ____ No   ____ Qualified Y/N

- If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?   ____ Yes   ____ No   __x__ Qualified Y/N

- Were the results tied to goals of student learning?   __x__ Yes   ____ No   ____ Qualified Y/N

Comments:

The annual report for 2015 reveals that the focus of measurement during the 2014-15 academic year was related to Goal 1 (Education). The data reveals that the 80% benchmark was achieved for both the faculty assessment of student' attainment of the core competencies and the student self-evaluation. The report did not indicate that there has been discussion of the assessment results and the implications for using the results to improve the program and the student experience.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken?   ____ Yes   __x__ No   ____ Qualified Y/N

- If so, were they based on assessment results?   ____ 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:

No specific closing the loop activities were mentioned in the annual report.

Revised 9/2015

SUMMARY

	Strengths		*Areas for Improvement*
x	A specific plan for assessment is in place.		No specific plan for 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.		Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
	Assessment methods are well-implemented.	x	Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
	Direct and indirect methods are implemented.		A single type of assessment methods predominates.
	Results are reported.		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 master of public health is a relatively new master's degree and the assessment plan, while rather well defined and contain a number of the essential elements goals, multiple measures, has yet to be operationalized to a point where findings are able to be used to enhance the student learning goals and program operations. It is recognized that the assessment process is a developmental process and would encourage the program to seek support from the University Assessment Committee and its consultants to assist with developing a strategy to more fully implement the plan particularly in the area of reporting results and closing the loop. As the program seeks full accreditation the assessment plan, process and findings could be an element in assisting the program to achieve the goal of accreditation. The expansion of the program to a number of satellite sites indicates the need for and benefit of this degree and the role it can play in enhancing health outcomes for residents of the Northern Plains region.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

x	Annual assessment report
x	Assessment plan (as posted)
	Previous assessment review
x	Other (please describe) – website and review of the program manual

Reviewers:	Name	Kenneth Flanagan	Shari Nelson	Devon Hansen
	Department	Social Work, N & D	Student Academic Services	Geography
	Phone Number	7-3769	7-0562	7-4587
	e-mail	kenneth.flanagan@und.edu	Shari.nelson@und.edu	Devon.hansen@und.edu

****

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

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