

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2014-15

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Occupational Therapy

DATE 2/9/16

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Masters in Occupational Therapy

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Mary Askim-Lovseth, Jim Casler, Joseph Appianing

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 Graduate Program in Occupational Therapy has six student learning goals (SLG) with numerous respective objectives. All are well articulated. Student learning goals are related to 1) theory/foundation knowledge; 2) evaluation process; 3) intervention process; 4) management process; 5) research process; 6) ethics, values and responsibilities for practice; and 7) communication.

The most recent assessment plan posted was dated May 2011. Inclusive in the assessment plan were the identification of Program goals and related outcomes.

The Program is accredited through the Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE). All student learning goals and objectives were developed to align with the accreditation standards. There is an additional campus location in Wyoming.

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> </u> | No | <u>X</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:

Only satisfaction surveys (graduates and employers) were used in the academic year under review; these are indirect assessment measures. Employer satisfaction with performance (use of subjective questions, 5-point Likert scale) mapped to the following goals/objectives—SLG 1, SLG 2, SLG 3, SLG 4.3, SLG 4.4, SLG 5, SLG 6, and SLG 7. The graduate survey did not align with the student learning goals.

The assessment plan indicated several direct and indirect assessment methods for each student learning goal and objective; these included fieldwork evaluations, employer evaluation of graduates, student evaluations of fieldwork, and the National Board of Certification in OT (NBCOT) exam. Also to be used were several student satisfaction surveys at different stages of the Program and post-graduation. Other measures were noted in the assessment plan—course exams, research papers, lab tests, etc.

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

Comments:

Mean scores were reported for the employer responses. SLG 2 was reported twice, by indicating it was SLG 2 and SLG 3; the mean scores were different. It is unclear what meaning is derived from the mean scores. What percentage of the graduates met expectations? The data do not provide any indicators of where improvement is needed though there must have been a section on the survey that addressed areas for improvement as some were noted.

The graduate survey had a Program focus (i.e., strengths, topics/skills to have more emphasis, general areas for improvement). Frequencies of some of the suggestions were provided.

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> X </u>	No	<u> </u>	Qualified Y/N
• If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	<u> </u>	Yes	<u> X </u>	No	<u> </u>	Qualified Y/N

Comments:

A curriculum review was undertaken in order to align ACOTE standards with the courses and to avoid duplication in the content delivery. Some minor realignment was done, such as moving the vital signs lab from one course to another. There was a comment of "Overall data suggest students are well-prepared for practice" but it was not aligned with any particular assessment results and student learning goals/objectives.

SUMMARY

Strengths

<u> X </u>	A specific plan for assessment is in place.
<u> X </u>	Student learning goals are well-articulated.
<u> </u>	Assessment methods are clearly described.
<u> </u>	Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
<u> </u>	Assessment methods are well-implemented.
<u> </u>	Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
<u> </u>	Results are reported.
<u> </u>	Results are tied to closing the loop.
<u> </u>	(Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

Areas for Improvement

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

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Department has a very extensive assessment plan for the Program, indicating multiple direct and indirect assessment measures for each student learning goal and objective. It seems daunting to have dozens of data collection points. Exams, assignments, papers, in-class learning activities, reflections, proposals, journals, etc., were noted in the assessment plan. Are grades used for these measures or are there rubrics that align with a specific objective? Selecting the most meaningful measures might be considered to create efficiencies in the assessment process. It is unclear at times how the specifics of the artifacts are mapped to the student learning goals and objectives.

Data were reported in the aggregate, such as a mean. It is unclear how a mean provides any specifics on what knowledge/skill needs to be improved. Consider aggregating the data based on how many/percentage of students who met, exceeded, or did not meet the competency. It seems that most of the direction for closing the loop comes from the subjective survey responses. The rationale for curriculum changes could be more carefully or fully articulated so as to be traced back to assessment results.

The AY 2014-15 annual report was an add-on to the other years. It was confusing to follow as one had to parcel out the relevant information that applied to the academic year under review. In the future it would be helpful to have a more streamlined report as the Committee can access the reports of previous years when needed.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

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

Reviewers:	Name	<u>Mary Askim-Lovseth</u>	<u>Jim Casler</u>	<u>Joseph Appianing</u>
	Department	<u>Marketing</u>	<u>Space Studies</u>	<u>Student</u>
	Phone Number	<u>777-2930</u>	<u>777-3462</u>	<u>777-4377</u>
	e-mail	<u>maskim@business.und.edu</u>	<u>casler@space.edu</u>	<u>Joseph.appianing@und.edu</u>

Section 1: Y Section 2: Q 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