

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

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Physical Therapy

DATE 1/15/16

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

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 program has five student learning goals with related measureable objectives for each, primarily focused on competencies and skills. These include skills for entry-level practice, critical inquiry skills for interpreting and applying research and also the ability to conduct research, service advocacy for the community and profession, professionalism, development of lifelong learning skills, and health and wellness advocacy. All are well articulated and address student learning.

The assessment plan has been recently updated regarding assessment strategies with subsequent timelines. A comprehensive approach to stakeholder inclusion was evident. Stakeholders included were—pre-PT students, enrolled PT students, clinical instructors, graduates, employers, patients, and alumni.

Two goals were addressed in the annual report.

SLG 1: The student will demonstrate the skills necessary for the entry level practice of practical examinations.

SLG 5: The student is to be an advocate for health and wellness at the individual and societal levels. (The goal does include “demonstrate respect for self and others, and a commitment to the profession of physical therapy” but this was not noted as a focus for assessment in the 2014-15 academic year.

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:

The National Physical Therapy Examination (NPTE) scores, this would be a direct measure, and course grades were noted as the measures to assess the student learning goals. Since grades are inclusive of several factors for a course, their use for assessment can be less useful as they do not provide direct alignment with the competencies. Because of course failure for a student and another leaving the program, reviews of admissions criteria, course content, and practice locations were done.

No assessment measures were noted for SLG 5 related to health and wellness advocacy though the faculty did look at external data regarding the shortage of physical therapists in North Dakota rural communities.

The assessment plan (strategies and timeline) does identify multiple assessment methods, direct and indirect, though there was no alignment with the specific goals and objectives. The notation was either “Program” or “Program & St. Learning”, and indicating direct or indirect.

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

Data from the NPTE were reported for SLG 1. The students that did the early testing all passed, receiving “scores well above a scale score of 600” which represents passing and licensure eligibility. When all students had completed the NPTE, the first attempt pass rate was 87.2 percent (41 of 47); this was below the national pass rate of 92.88 percent. The UND mean scale score was 672.8 compared to the national mean of 680.6. It is unclear if the NPTE score is delineated by competency area in order to determine specific areas for improvement.

No data were provided for SLG 5 which related to being a health and wellness advocate for individuals and society; rather it was noted that faculty reviewed the UND SMHS Workforce Study and information from the ND Board of Physical Therapy to determine a workforce shortage of physical therapists in small, rural ND communities.

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

Comments:

It was noted in the annual report that “the 2014-2015 focus within the department had not been on ‘closing the loop’ activities” though there were comments that would be indicative of work in this area. Because of the drop from the prior year in the pass rate, there has been a review of the application standards and the students’ academic profiles, and the curriculum (i.e., objectives, content, course sequencing, and pedagogy). With new curriculum Standards and Required Elements from the accrediting body (Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education, CAPTE), faculty have been reviewing their courses for alignment. Reaccreditation site visit is slated for 2017. It would be expected that curricular changes may result from these review activities. The remediation policy was addressed after two student instances where that was specifically needed. The policy is now formalized as part of the program’s Scholastic Standards. Two courses were validated for fulfilling the Essential Studies requirement in Communication; this would relate directly to SLG 1.5, “The student will demonstrate effective written and oral communication skills.”

Faculty believe the impending move to the new SMHS building will have a direct impact on pedagogy and student learning by providing opportunities to emphasize interdisciplinary learning, learning communities, and experiential learning through clinical simulations and experiences. These enhancements will be monitored for their impact on student success.

SUMMARY

Strengths

<u>X</u>	A specific plan for assessment is in place.
<u>X</u>	Student learning goals are well-articulated.
	Assessment methods are clearly described.
<u>X</u>	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 assessment plan for the DPT program has well articulated goal and objectives related to student learning. A variety of assessment methods are noted, both direct and indirect, with the inclusion of various stakeholders (i.e., patients, employers, alumni). Though the tables are quite extensive laying out the assessment matrix, it is recommended that the assessment methods be aligned with the student learning goals and objectives rather than the noted "St. Learning" designation.

When reviewing the annual reports of the last three years, the Department has focused on assessing SLG 1 each year. Though the assessment plan indicated many assessments are ongoing, without alignment to goals and no reporting of anything other than SLG 1, it is unclear if the Department has assessed each goal and objective on a cyclical basis. Is the Department able to "tease out" the data collected from the different surveys, examinations, and interviews to specifically address each goal/objective?

With a new teaching environment in the near future, and the new accreditation Standards, the Committee is looking forward to reading about their impact on student learning in future annual reports

MATERIALS REVIEWED

<u>X</u>	Annual assessment report (AYs 2014-15, 2013-14, 2012-13)
<u>X</u>	Assessment plan (as posted)
<u>X</u>	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: Q 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