

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2014 - 2015

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Medical Laboratory Science **DATE** April *, 2016

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW B.S. in Medical Laboratory Science

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Bradley Myers, Deborah Worley & Shawn McHale

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 Department revised its assessment plan in June of 2015. It identifies departmental learning and assessment goals, assessment strategies and also contains separate learning and teaching goals for each of the Department's degree and certificate programs. For the B.S. Degree, the plan identifies five learning goals, with 18 associated objectives and two teaching goals, with seven associated objectives. (These goals and objectives are the same as for the MLS Certificate). For each of the learning goals the plan identifies courses in which assessment can take place, the method for assessment, the frequency of assessment, who has responsibility for the assessment and how the assessment will be documented. The driving factor that triggered the revision to the assessment plan was changes in the NAACLS accreditation standards that shifted the focus on inputs to outputs. In addition to updating the Department's mission, philosophy and learning goal's, it created several different tools used to gather assessment data by faculty.*

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

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| <u>X</u> | 1. Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”) |
| <u>X</u> | 2. Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate) |
| <u> </u> | 3. Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage) |
| <u>X</u> | 4. Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”) |
| <u> </u> | 5. Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”) |
| <u> </u> | 6. Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”) |
| <u> </u> | 7. Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”) |
| <u> </u> | 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: *Some of the identified learning objectives appear to have specifically included in order to introduce elements of Essential Studies into the program of study.*

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> </u> | Yes | <u>X</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? | _____ | Yes | X | No |
| | _____ | | | Qualified Y/N |

Comments: The Department reports that it collected and reviewed data related to four of its learning goals. The Department also reports that it “focused on reviewing the performance of our recent graduates on our profession’s national board of certification entry-level examination.” No data from that review was reported, but the Department did conclude that all its graduates “are performing well on the national board of certification. It should be noted that assessment activity for the academic year would have occurred prior to the adoption of the Department’s new 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? | _____ | Yes | X | No | _____ | Qualified Y/N |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? | _____ | Yes | X | No | _____ | Qualified Y/N |
| • Were the results tied to goals of student learning? | X | Yes | _____ | No | _____ | Qualified Y/N |

Comments: The Department only reports the response of students to a single question regarding their clinical internship. (The Department consolidated the data from its BS students with those in its MLS certificate program). The question was: “In general, I believe I was adequately prepared for MLS 470 level coursework?” 62 of the 72 on-campus students and 7 of the 7 online students agreed with the statement that they felt prepared for MLS 470 level coursework. The Department also reports that it has “been working on reviewing the curriculum change within its courses that teach immunology.” The changes, implement over the last five years, are associated with an increase in the scores of the Department’s graduates on the immunology subpart of the ASCP MLS Board of Certification examination, which now exceed the national average.

In addition to program goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. Please identify those results which are applicable to institutional/Essential Studies goal achievement. For indicated items, please 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 programmatic, institutional, and Essential Studies goals:

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

- | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|-----|-------|----|-------|---------------|
| Were any actions taken? | X | Yes | _____ | No | _____ | Qualified Y/N |
| • If so, were they based on assessment results? | _____ | Yes | _____ | No | X | Qualified Y/N |
| • If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from | X | Yes | _____ | No | _____ | Qualified Y/N |

assessment results directly address goals for student learning? _____

Comments: The Department reports that it intends to use the modifications it made to its immunology courses as a model for revising courses covering other areas of the curriculum. It also reports that it decided to hire an additional staff person to provide additional support to its clinical site coordinators. This was done in response to previous student feedback identifying increased communication with the Department as a priority in helping enhance student connectivity to the Department

SUMMARY

Strengths

Areas for Improvement

☒ 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.)

☐ 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:

The Department has adopted a comprehensive new assessment plan and the committee looks forward to seeing its successful implementation. Since the plan adopts clear learning goals and objectives for each of its programs, future reports should report the assessment activities separately for each program (though it may make sense to report the B.S. and the MLS Certificate together).

MATERIALS REVIEWED

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

Reviewers	Name	Bradley Myers	Deborah Worley	Shawn McHale
	Department	Law School	Educational Leadership	
	Phone Number	7-2228	7-3140	
	e-mail	myers@law.und.edu	deborah.worley@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 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

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2014-2015 (Academic Year)

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Medical Laboratory Science

DATE April *, 2016

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW MLS Certificate

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Bradley Myers, Deborah Worley & Shawn McHale

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 Department revised its assessment plan in June of 2015. It identifies departmental learning and assessment goals, assessment strategies and also contains separate learning and teaching goals for each of the Department's degree and certificate programs. For the MLS Certificate, which is for students who have already completed a bachelor's degree, the plan identifies five learning goals, with 18 associated objectives and two teaching goals, with seven associated objectives. (These goals and objectives are the same as for the B.S. in MLS). For each of the learning goals the plan identifies courses in which assessment can take place, the method for assessment, the frequency of assessment, who has responsibility for the assessment and how the assessment will be documented. The driving factor that triggered the revision to the assessment plan was changes in the NAACLS accreditation standards that shifted the focus on inputs to outputs. In addition to updating the Department's mission, philosophy and learning goal's, it created several different tools used to gather assessment data by faculty.

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 appropriately aligned with individual goals? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |

Comments: The Department reports that it collected and reviewed data related to 3 of its learning goals. While the Department reports that it used feedback from the student exit evaluation, it only reports the responses to one question. The Department also reports that it "focused on reviewing the performance of our recent graduates on our profession's national board of certification entry-level examination." No data from that review was reported, but the Department did conclude that all its graduates "are performing well on the national board of certification. It should be noted that assessment activity for the academic year would have occurred prior to the adoption of the Department's new assessment plan.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

- | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----|-------------|----|-------------|---------------|
| Were any assessment results reported? | <u>X</u> | Yes | <u> </u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----|-------------|----|-------------|---------------|

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|-----|---------------|----|---------------|---------------|
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u> X </u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u> X </u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • Were the results tied to goals of student learning? | <u> X </u> | Yes | <u> </u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |

Comments: The Department only reports the response of students to a single question regarding their clinical internship. (The Department consolidated the data from its BS students with those in its MLS certificate program). The question was: "In general, I believe I was adequately prepared for MLS 470 level coursework?" 62 of the 72 on-campus students and 7 of the 7 online students agreed with the statement that they felt prepared for MLS 470 level coursework. The Department also reports that it has "been working on reviewing the curriculum change within its courses that teach immunology." The changes, implement over the last five years, are associated with an increase in the scores of the Department's graduates on the immunology subpart of the ASCP MLS Board of Certification examination, which now exceed the national average.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|-----|---------------|----|---------------|---------------|
| Were any actions taken? | <u> X </u> | Yes | <u> </u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • If so, were they based on assessment results? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u> </u> | No | <u> X </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning? | <u> X </u> | Yes | <u> </u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |

Comments:

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.
- 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:

The Department has adopted a comprehensive new assessment plan and the committee looks forward to seeing its successful implementation. Since the plan adopts clear learning goals and objectives for each of its programs, future reports should report the assessment activities separately for each program (though it may make sense to report the B.S. and the MLS Certificate together).

MATERIALS REVIEWED

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

Reviewers:	Name	<u>Bradley Myers</u>	<u>Deborah Worley</u>	<u>Shawn McHale</u>
	Department	<u>Law School</u>	<u>Educational</u>	
			<u>Leadership</u>	
	Phone Number	<u>7-2228</u>	<u>7-3140</u>	
	e-mail	<u>myers@law.und.edu</u>	<u>deborah.worley@un</u>	
			<u>d.edu</u>	

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 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

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2014-2015 (Academic Year)

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Medical Laboratory Science DATE April *, 2016

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Chemistry/Urinalysis Categorical Certificate

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Bradley Myers, Deborah Worley & Shawn McHale

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 Department revised its assessment plan in June of 2015. It identifies departmental learning and assessment goals, assessment strategies and also contains separate learning and teaching goals for each of the Department's degree and certificate programs. For the Chemistry/Urinalysis Categorical Certificate, the plan identifies five learning goals, with 18 associated objectives and two teaching goals, with seven associated objectives. For each of the learning goals the plan identifies courses in which assessment can take place, the method for assessment, the frequency of assessment, who has responsibility for the assessment and how the assessment will be documented. The driving factor that triggered the revision to the assessment plan was changes in the NAACLS accreditation standards that shifted the focus on inputs to outputs. In addition to updating the Department's mission, philosophy and learning goal's, it created several different tools used to gather assessment data by faculty.

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 appropriately aligned with individual goals? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |

Comments: The Department reports that it collected and reviewed data related to 3 of its learning goals. However, the Department reports results from only one assessment method: the Chemistry Categorical Certificate Exam.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|-----|---------------|----|---------------|---------------|
| Were any assessment results reported? | <u>X</u> | Yes | <u> </u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • Were the results tied to goals of student learning? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |

Comments: The Department reports that six graduates took the exam during the year and that all six passed. (The pass rate is based on the self-reporting of its graduates because the agency administering the exam does not provide them with detailed information regarding performance.)

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken?	<u>X</u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u> </u>	Qualified Y/N
• If so, were they based on assessment results?	<u> </u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u>X</u>	Qualified Y/N
• If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	<u>X</u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u> </u>	Qualified Y/N

Comments: The Department reports that it has changed some of the courses in the program of study. In particular, content on Body Fluid Analysis has been added to courses in the Chemistry/Urinalysis Categorical Certificate program.

SUMMARY

Strengths

Areas for Improvement

<u>X</u>	A specific plan for assessment is in place.	<u> </u>	No specific plan for assessment is in place.
<u>X</u>	Student learning goals are well-articulated.	<u> </u>	Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
<u>X</u>	Assessment methods are clearly described.	<u> </u>	Assessment methods are not clearly described.
<u>X</u>	Assessment methods are appropriately selected.	<u> </u>	Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
<u> </u>	Assessment methods are well-implemented.	<u> </u>	Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
<u> </u>	Direct and indirect methods are implemented.	<u> </u>	A single type of assessment methods predominates.
<u> </u>	Results are reported.	<u> </u>	No results are reported.
<u> </u>	Results are tied to closing the loop.	<u> </u>	Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
<u> </u>	(Decision-making is tied to evidence.)	<u> </u>	(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Department has adopted a comprehensive new assessment plan and the committee looks forward to seeing its successful implementation. Since the plan adopts clear learning goals and objectives for each of its programs, future reports should report the assessment activities separately for each program.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

<u>X</u>	Annual assessment report
<u>X</u>	Assessment plan (as posted)
<u>X</u>	Previous assessment review
<u> </u>	Other (please describe)

Reviewers:	Name	<u>Bradley Myers</u>	<u>Deborah Worley</u>	<u>Shawn McHale</u>
	Department	<u>Law School</u>	<u>Educational Leadership</u>	<u></u>
	Phone Number	<u>7-2228</u>	<u>7-3140</u>	<u></u>
	e-mail	<u>myers@law.und.edu</u>	<u>deborah.worley@und.edu</u>	<u></u>

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 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

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2014-2015

(Academic Year)

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Medical Laboratory Science **DATE** April *, 2016

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Hematology/Hemostasis Categorical Certificate

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Bradley Myers, Deborah Worley & Shawn McHale

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> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • Do goals address student learning? | <u>X</u> | Yes | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |

***Comments:** The Department revised its assessment plan in June of 2015. It identifies departmental learning and assessment goals, assessment strategies and also contains separate learning and teaching goals for each of the Department's degree and certificate programs. For the Hematology/Hemostasis Categorical Certificate, the plan identifies five learning goals, with 18 associated objectives and two teaching goals, with seven associated objectives. For each of the learning goals the plan identifies courses in which assessment can take place, the method for assessment, the frequency of assessment, who has responsibility for the assessment and how the assessment will be documented. The driving factor that triggered the revision to the assessment plan was changes in the NAACLS accreditation standards that shifted the focus on inputs to outputs. In addition to updating the Department's mission, philosophy and learning goal's, it created several different tools used to gather assessment data by faculty.*

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 appropriately aligned with individual goals? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |

***Comments:** The Department reports that it collected and reviewed data related to 3 of its learning goals. However, the Department reports results from only one assessment method: the Hematology Categorical Certificate Exam.*

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|-----|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Were any assessment results reported? | <u>X</u> | Yes | <u> </u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |

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

Comments: The Department reports that five graduates took the exam during the year and that all five passed. (The pass rate is based on the self-reporting of its graduates because the agency administering the exam does not provide them with detailed information regarding performance.)

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

- Were any actions taken? X Yes No Qualified Y/N
- If so, were they based on assessment results? Yes No X 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 Department reports that it has changed some of the courses in the program of study. In particular, content on Body Fluid Analysis has been added to courses in the Hematology/Hemostasis Categorical Certificate program.

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.
- 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:

The Department has adopted a comprehensive new assessment plan and the committee looks forward to seeing its successful implementation. Since the plan adopts clear learning goals and objectives for each of its programs, future reports should report the assessment activities separately for each program.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

- X Annual assessment report
- X Assessment plan (as posted)
- X Previous assessment review

Other (please describe)

Reviewers:	Name	<u>Bradley Myers</u>	<u>Deborah Worley</u>	<u>Shawn McHale</u>
	Department	<u>Law School</u>	<u>Educational Leadership</u>	<u></u>
	Phone Number	<u>7-2228</u>	<u>7-3140</u>	<u></u>
	e-mail	<u>myers@law.und.edu</u>	<u>deborah.worley@und.edu</u>	<u></u>

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 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

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2014 - 2015

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Medical Laboratory Science

DATE April *, 2016

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Histotechnician Certificate

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW

Bradley Myers, Deborah Worley & Shawn McHale

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 Department revised its assessment plan in June of 2015. It identifies departmental learning and assessment goals, assessment strategies and also contains separate learning and teaching goals for each of the Department's degree and certificate programs. For the HT Certificate, the plan identifies five learning goals, with 18 associated objectives and two teaching goals, with seven associated objectives. For each of the learning goals the plan identifies courses in which assessment can take place, the method for assessment, the frequency of assessment, who has responsibility for the assessment and how the assessment will be documented. The driving factor that triggered the revision to the assessment plan was changes in the NAACLS accreditation standards that shifted the focus on inputs to outputs. In addition to updating the Department's mission, philosophy and learning goal's, it created several different tools used to gather assessment data by faculty.*

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

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| <u>X</u> | 1. Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”) |
| <u>X</u> | 2. Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate) |
| <u> </u> | 3. Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage) |
| <u>X</u> | 4. Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”) |
| <u> </u> | 5. Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”) |
| <u> </u> | 6. Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”) |
| <u> </u> | 7. Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”) |
| <u> </u> | 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:** Some of the identified learning objectives appear to have specifically included in order to introduce elements of Essential Studies into the program of study.*

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 appropriately aligned with individual goals? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |

- Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach? ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Qualified Y/N

Comments: The Department reports that it collected and reviewed data related to 3 of its learning goals. However, the Department reports results from only one assessment method: the ASCP HT Certification Exam.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

- Were any assessment results reported? ☒ Yes ☐ 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
 - If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Qualified Y/N
 - Were the results tied to goals of student learning? ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Qualified Y/N

Comments: The Department reports results for the ASCP HT Certificate exam for two different, but overlapping, time periods. For 2014-15, nine graduates took the exam and eight passed it. For the 2014 calendar year, all students who took the exam passed it.

In addition to program goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. Please identify those results which are applicable to institutional/Essential Studies goal achievement. For indicated items, please 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 programmatic, institutional, and Essential Studies goals:

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

- Were any actions taken? ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Qualified Y/N
- If so, were they based on assessment results? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Qualified Y/N
 - If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning? ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Qualified Y/N

Comments: The Department reports that it has changed its admissions criteria to require incoming students to have at least an Associate’s degree before entering the program. This change was in response to revised accreditation standards, however, not do to assessment results. The Department has also changed the content of a number of its courses to include a greater focus on problem solving skills. This was in response to the performance of graduates on the national board certification examinations, and feedback from the HT Advisory Committee (which is composed of current students, alumni, clinical affiliates, faculty and employers).

SUMMARY

Strengths

Areas for Improvement

- ☒ 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.)

- ☐ 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:

The Department has adopted a comprehensive new assessment plan and the committee looks forward to seeing its successful implementation. Since the plan adopts clear learning goals and objectives for each of its programs, future reports should report the assessment activities separately for each program.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

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

Reviewers	Name	Bradley Myers	Deborah Worley	Shawn McHale
	Department	Law School	Educational Leadership	
	Phone Number	7-2228	7-3140	
	e-mail	myers@law.und.edu	deborah.worley@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 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

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2014-2015 (Academic Year)

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Medical Laboratory Science DATE April *, 2016

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Immunohematology Categorical Certificate

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Bradley Myers, Deborah Worley & Shawn McHale

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 Department revised its assessment plan in June of 2015. It identifies departmental learning and assessment goals, assessment strategies and also contains separate learning and teaching goals for each of the Department's degree and certificate programs. For the Immunohematology Categorical Certificate, the plan identifies five learning goals, with 18 associated objectives and two teaching goals, with seven associated objectives. For each of the learning goals the plan identifies courses in which assessment can take place, the method for assessment, the frequency of assessment, who has responsibility for the assessment and how the assessment will be documented. The driving factor that triggered the revision to the assessment plan was changes in the NAACLS accreditation standards that shifted the focus on inputs to outputs. In addition to updating the Department's mission, philosophy and learning goal's, it created several different tools used to gather assessment data by faculty.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|-----|----------|----|---------------|---------------|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |

Comments: Although the Department reports that it assessed three of the Learning Goals, it had no students who took the Immunohematology Categorical Certification Exam.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|-----|----------|----|---------------|---------------|
| Were any assessment results reported? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • Were the results tied to goals of student learning? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |

Comments:

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken?

- If so, were they based on assessment results?

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

<u>X</u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u> </u>	Qualified Y/N
<u> </u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u>X</u>	Qualified Y/N
<u>X</u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u> </u>	Qualified Y/N

Comments: *The Department reports that it has changed some of the courses in the program of study.*

SUMMARY

Strengths

Areas for Improvement

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.
 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.)

 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:

The Department has adopted a comprehensive new assessment plan and the committee looks forward to seeing its successful implementation. Since the plan adopts clear learning goals and objectives for each of its programs, future reports should report the assessment activities separately for each program.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

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

Reviewers:	Name	<u>Bradley Myers</u>	<u>Deborah Worley</u>	<u>Shawn McHale</u>
	Department	<u>Law School</u>	<u>Educational Leadership</u>	<u> </u>

Phone Number	<u>7-2228</u>	<u>7-3140</u>	<u></u>
e-mail	<u>myers@law.und.edu</u>	<u>deborah.worley@und.edu</u>	<u></u>

Section 1: Y Section 2: N Section 3: N 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 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

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2014-2015 (Academic Year)

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Medical Laboratory Science

DATE April *, 2016

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW M.S. in Medical Laboratory Science

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Bradley Myers, Deborah Worley & Shawn McHale

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 Department revised its assessment plan in June of 2015. It identifies departmental learning and assessment goals, assessment strategies and also contains separate learning and teaching goals for each of the Department's degree and certificate programs. For the M.S. Degree, the plan identifies four learning goals, with 14 associated objectives and two teaching goals, with six associated objectives. For each of the learning goals the plan identifies courses in which assessment can take place, the method for assessment, the frequency of assessment, who has responsibility for the assessment and how the assessment will be documented. The driving factor that triggered the revision to the assessment plan was changes in the NAACLS accreditation standards that shifted the focus on inputs to outputs. In addition to updating the Department's mission, philosophy and learning goal's, it created several different tools used to gather assessment data by faculty.

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 appropriately aligned with individual goals? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |

Comments: The Department reports that it collected and reviewed data related to four of its learning goals. It did so through an "evaluation of student performance on graduate comprehensive exams" and "student feedback and review in MLS 515 and 524."

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|-----|----------|----|---------------|---------------|
| Were any assessment results reported? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • Were the results tied to goals of student learning? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |

Comments: The Department did not report any results.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken?	<u>X</u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u> </u>	Qualified Y/N
• If so, were they based on assessment results?	<u> </u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u>X</u>	Qualified Y/N
• If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	<u>X</u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u> </u>	Qualified Y/N

Comments: The Department began implementation of a new curriculum for the M.S. starting in the fall of 1995. Courses were restructured to focus on strengthening the professional communication skills of graduate students. The Department also added a new Foundational course that focuses on the different skills needed to be an educator, consultant, or manager in medical laboratory science. The Department has also revised its comprehensive examination process and designated a faculty member to serve as graduate program coordinator. The changes were based on the performance of recent graduates on their written comprehensive exams. recent graduate feedback that called for an increased program oversight and organization. The Department has created a new survey tool that can gather additional information about student performance at different checkpoints in their program of study.

SUMMARY

Strengths

Areas for Improvement

<u>X</u>	A specific plan for assessment is in place.	<u> </u>	No specific plan for assessment is in place.
<u>X</u>	Student learning goals are well-articulated.	<u> </u>	Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
<u>X</u>	Assessment methods are clearly described.	<u> </u>	Assessment methods are not clearly described.
<u>X</u>	Assessment methods are appropriately selected.	<u> </u>	Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
<u> </u>	Assessment methods are well-implemented.	<u> </u>	Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
<u> </u>	Direct and indirect methods are implemented.	<u> </u>	A single type of assessment methods predominates.
<u> </u>	Results are reported.	<u> </u>	No results are reported.
<u> </u>	Results are tied to closing the loop.	<u> </u>	Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
<u> </u>	(Decision-making is tied to evidence.)	<u> </u>	(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Department has adopted a comprehensive new assessment plan and the committee looks forward to seeing its successful implementation. Since the plan adopts clear learning goals and objectives for each of its programs, future reports should report the assessment activities separately for each program.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

<u>X</u>	Annual assessment report
<u>X</u>	Assessment plan (as posted)

X Previous assessment review
 Other (please describe)

Reviewers:	Name	<u>Bradley Myers</u>	<u>Deborah Worley</u>	<u>Shawn McHale</u>
	Department	<u>Law School</u>	<u>Educational Leadership</u>	<u> </u>
	Phone Number	<u>7-2228</u>	<u>7-3140</u>	<u> </u>
	e-mail	<u>myers@law.und.edu</u>	<u>deborah.worley@und.edu</u>	<u> </u>

Section 1: Y Section 2: Q Section 3: N 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 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

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2014-2015 (Academic Year)

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Medical Laboratory Science DATE April *, 2016

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Microbiology Categorical Certificate

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Bradley Myers, Deborah Worley & Shawn McHale

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 Department revised its assessment plan in June of 2015. It identifies departmental learning and assessment goals, assessment strategies and also contains separate learning and teaching goals for each of the Department's degree and certificate programs. For the Microbiology Categorical Certificate, the plan identifies five learning goals, with 18 associated objectives and two teaching goals, with seven associated objectives. For each of the learning goals the plan identifies courses in which assessment can take place, the method for assessment, the frequency of assessment, who has responsibility for the assessment and how the assessment will be documented. The driving factor that triggered the revision to the assessment plan was changes in the NAACLS accreditation standards that shifted the focus on inputs to outputs. In addition to updating the Department's mission, philosophy and learning goal's, it created several different tools used to gather assessment data by faculty.

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 appropriately aligned with individual goals? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |

Comments: The Department reports that it collected and reviewed data related to 3 of its learning goals. However, the Department reports results from only one assessment method: the Hematology Categorical Certificate Exam.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|-----|---------------|----|---------------|---------------|
| Were any assessment results reported? | <u>X</u> | Yes | <u> </u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • Were the results tied to goals of student learning? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |

Comments: The Department reports that two graduates took the exam during the year and that both passed. (The pass rate is based on the self-reporting of its graduates because the agency administering the exam does not provide them with detailed information regarding performance.)

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken?	<u>X</u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u> </u>	Qualified Y/N
• If so, were they based on assessment results?	<u> </u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u>X</u>	Qualified Y/N
• If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	<u>X</u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u> </u>	Qualified Y/N

Comments: The Department reports that it has changed some of the courses in the program of study.

SUMMARY

<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Areas for Improvement</i>
<u>X</u> A specific plan for assessment is in place.	<u> </u> No specific plan for assessment is in place.
<u>X</u> Student learning goals are well-articulated.	<u> </u> Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
<u>X</u> Assessment methods are clearly described.	<u> </u> Assessment methods are not clearly described.
<u>X</u> Assessment methods are appropriately selected.	<u> </u> Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
<u> </u> Assessment methods are well-implemented.	<u> </u> Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
<u> </u> Direct and indirect methods are implemented.	<u> </u> A single type of assessment methods predominates.
<u> </u> Results are reported.	<u> </u> No results are reported.
<u> </u> Results are tied to closing the loop.	<u> </u> Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
<u> </u> (Decision-making is tied to evidence.)	<u> </u> (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Department has adopted a comprehensive new assessment plan and the committee looks forward to seeing its successful implementation. Since the plan adopts clear learning goals and objectives for each of its programs, future reports should report the assessment activities separately for each program.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

<u>X</u>	Annual assessment report
<u>X</u>	Assessment plan (as posted)
<u>X</u>	Previous assessment review
<u> </u>	Other (please describe)

Reviewers: Name Bradley Myers Deborah Worley Shawn McHale

Department	<u>Law School</u>	<u>Educational Leadership</u>	<u></u>
Phone Number	<u>7-2228</u>	<u>7-3140</u>	<u></u>
e-mail	<u>myers@law.und.edu</u>	<u>deborah.worley@und.edu</u>	<u></u>

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 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