

Student Learning Summary Form AY2015-16

Due to your dean by June 1

Due from dean to assessment office by June 15

Degree Program Name: MS/post MS FNP Concentration **Contact Name and Email** Debra Vincent, PhD, FNP-BC, Asst Prof, Director FNP Program

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary.

Part One

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, indicate the Graduate Student Learning Outcome* each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. (1) What method(s) did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</p>	<p>c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual results?</p>	<p>e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?</p>
<p>1. Program Goal: Critical Thinker</p> <p>1. Synthesizes theoretical frameworks used in the integration of knowledge from related sciences and humanities, clinical knowledge, and nursing sciences as the foundations for advanced nursing practice.</p> <p>2. Analyzes the significance of advanced nursing knowledge as it relates to selected populations.</p>	<p>Annually in February In courses (644, 664, and 670) where two expanded notes were required the scores of the final expanded note would be used to examine the achievement levels of students in obtaining the expected 83% or higher on the assignment.</p>	<p>Operational Definition: Successful completion of expanded SOAP notes and/or Case studies as evidenced by grade of 83% B or better</p> <p>Expected Level of Achievement/Decision Rule of Action: 90% of students will achieve operational definition</p>	<p><i>Spring 2015 APN 644</i> n = 26. Scores on final expanded note range from 94-100%. All scores were over the 83% benchmark.</p> <p><i>Summer 2015 APN 644</i> n = 23. 21 Scores on the final expanded note were 90% or better and met benchmark. One less than 83% and student failed course, one score of 83%.</p> <p><i>Fall 2014 APN 664</i> n = 26. Scores on final Expanded note range from 76-100%. One score under 83%</p> <p><i>Summer 2015 APN 664</i> n = 43. Scores on final expanded note range from 90-100%. No scores</p>	<p>1. Faculty for APN 644, APN 664, and APN 670</p> <p>2. Results shared at monthly Assessment meeting within department via Faculty discussion</p>

			<p>under the benchmark of 83%</p> <p><i>Fall 2014 APN 670</i> n = 26. Scores on final expanded note range from 63 -100%. Two scores under the benchmark of 83%</p> <p><i>Spring 2015 APN 670</i> n = 26. Scores on final expanded note range from 82 -100%. One score under the benchmark of 83%</p>	
<p>2. Program Goal: Communicator</p> <p>1. Communicates effectively both orally and in writing in a manner that commands professional attention.</p> <p>2. Uses technology strategically to access, organize, document, and present information</p>	<p>Annually in October APN 697</p> <p>1. Evidence Based Practice project manuscript score and submission to peer-reviewed journal</p> <p>2. APN 670 student clinical evaluation tool: Item #3 score of 2 or better</p>	<p>Operational Definition:</p> <p>*1) Successful completion of APN 697 EBP project manuscript as evidenced by grade of 83% B or better and submission of final manuscript to peer reviewed journal.</p> <p>2) Demonstrates a 2 (0-4 scale) or better on Likert scale for item #3 on APN 670 Student Clinical Evaluation Tool.</p> <p>Expected Level of Achievement/Decision Rule of Action</p> <p>90% of students will achieve operational definition</p>	<p><i>Fall 2014</i> APN 697 section 301/302 N = 10 100% students earned at least 83% or better on the final manuscript submission and 100% students submitted manuscript to a peer reviewed journal.</p> <p>APN 697 section 303 Eley/Moore/Vincent N = 16 100% students Completed a final Manuscript with a Score of 83% or Better. 100% students submitted final manuscript to a peer reviewed journal as evidenced by submission of verification of electronic submission from the selected journal.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Faculty for APN 697 and APN 670 2. Results shared at monthly Assessment meeting within department via Faculty discussion

			<p><i>SPRING 2015</i> APN 697 all sections N = 22 100% students Completed a final Manuscript with a Score of 83% or Better (2 students earned 86%, and 2 students earned 83%). 100% students submitted final manuscript to a peer reviewed journal as evidenced by submission of verification of electronic submission from the selected journal.</p> <p>Fall 2014 APN 670 N = 26. 100% of students achieved a score of 2 or better on the evaluation tool.</p> <p>Spring 2015 APN 670 N = 26. 100% of students achieved a score of 2 or better on the evaluation tool.</p>	
<p>3. Program Goal: Advanced Provider #1-3 1. Meets advanced practice competencies for selected populations.</p> <p>2. Provides safe, cost-effective, and culturally adaptive advanced practice nursing for special populations.</p> <p>3. Evaluates outcomes of</p>	<p>Annually in November APN 670 Clinical Evaluation Tool based on 0-4 Likert Scale and successful completion of the program’s final clinical component.</p>	<p>Operational Definition: Average scores at 2 or above on Likert Scale (0- 4) APN 670 Clinical Evaluation Tool and successful completion of the program’s final clinical component.</p> <p>Expected Level of Achievement/Decision Rule of Action: 90% of students will</p>	<p><i>Fall 2014 APN670 (N=26)</i> 100% of students averaged greater than a “2” on Likert scale (0-4) on clinical evaluation tool. 100% of students passed the program’s final clinical component</p> <p><i>Spring 2015 (N=26, one failure, thus N=25).</i> 100% of students averaged greater than a</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Faculty for APN 670 2. Results shared at monthly Assessment meeting within department via Faculty discussion

<p>advanced practice nursing interventions, methods, or strategies.</p>		<p>achieve operational definition</p>	<p>"2" on Likert scale (0-4) on clinical evaluation tool. One student did not pass the final clinical component for the program (did not meet clinical requirements)</p>	
<p>4. Program Goal: Advanced Provider #4-6 4. Collaborates with others in the implementation of advanced practice nursing.</p> <p>5. Provides expert consultation to others to resolve complex problems related to client-care situations, and /or health care delivery systems, and/or education.</p> <p>6. Develops, implements, and evaluates educational programs for selected populations.</p>	<p>Annually in November APN 670 expanded SOAP note scores (or combined long soap note scores) and APN 670 combined semester Typhon Evaluation scores</p>	<p>Operational Definition: Successful completion of the program's final clinical preceptorship in APN 670 as demonstrated by grade "B" (83%) or better on long soap note(s) and averaged Typhon Evaluations</p> <p>Expected Level of Achievement/Decision Rule of Action: 90% of students will achieve operational definition</p>	<p><i>Fall 2014 APN 670</i> (N= 26). Overall Typhon average for 2 scores (all students)= 96%. Lowest student average (1) 83% otherwise all above 83%.</p> <p><i>Spring 2015 APN 670</i> (N= 26, one failure, thus N= 25) Overall Typhon average for 2 scores (all students)= 97%. Lowest student average (1) 93% otherwise all above 93%.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Faculty for APN 670 2. Results shared at monthly Assessment meeting within department via Faculty discussion
<p>5. Program Goal: Leader 1. Assumes a leadership role in one or more areas: health care, professional organizations, community, research, and/or education.</p> <p>2. Interprets the role and functions of the nurse prepared at the master's level to clients, nurses and other health care provides, and policy-</p>	<p>Annually in October APN 697 Evidence Based Practice project manuscript score and submission to peer-reviewed journal.</p>	<p>Operational Definition: * Successful completion of APN 697 EBP project manuscript as evidenced by grade of 83% B and submission of final manuscript to peer reviewed journal.</p> <p>Expected Level of Achievement/Decision Rule of Action: 90% of students will achieve at or above the</p>	<p><i>Fall 2014</i> APN 697 section 301/302 N = 10 100% students earned at least 83% or better on the final manuscript submission and 100% students submitted to a peer reviewed journal.</p> <p>APN 697 section 303 N = 16 100% students Completed a final</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Faculty for APN 697 – all sections 2. Results shared at monthly Assessment meeting within department via Faculty discussion

<p>makers.</p> <p>3. Works collegially to design, implement, and evaluate programs for performance improvement.</p> <p>4. Coordinates the implementation of evidence-based practice.</p>		<p>operational definition</p>	<p>Manuscript with a Score of 83% or Better. 100% students submitted final manuscript to a peer reviewed journal as evidenced by submission of verification of electronic submission from the selected journal.</p> <p><i>SPRING 2015</i> APN 697 all sections N = 22 100% students Completed a final Manuscript with a Score of 83% or Better (2 students earned 86%, and 2 students earned 83%). 100% students submitted final manuscript to a peer reviewed journal as evidenced by submission of verification of electronic submission from the selected journal.</p>	
<p>6. Program Goal: Professional</p> <p>1. Models professional behavior.</p> <p>2. Demonstrates accountability for advanced practice nursing decisions based on ethical and professional standards.</p> <p>3. Interprets the role functions of expert</p>	<p>Annually in February APN 670 student clinical evaluation tool and track those that score less than 2.</p>	<p>Operational Definition: Scores a minimum of 2 on all items on the Likert Scale APN 670 Student Clinical Evaluation Tool.</p> <p>Expected Level of Achievement/Decision Rule of Action: 90% of students will achieve at or above the operational definition</p>	<p><i>Fall 2014 APN 670</i> n = 26. Scores on all evaluations were all at a level 2 and above.</p> <p><i>Spring 2015 APN 670</i> n = 26. Scores on all evaluations were all at a level 2 and above.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Faculty for APN 670 2. Results shared at monthly Assessment meeting within department via Faculty discussion

<p>clinician, educator, researcher, administrator, and consultant and implements these roles, as appropriate, based on specialty preparation.</p>				
<p>7. Program Goal: Life-Long Learner</p> <p>1. Assumes responsibility to maintain current knowledge in professional nursing practice by articulating a plan for life-long learning.</p> <p>2. Promotes excellence in nursing through regular attendance at educational activities designed to expand knowledge and competencies.</p> <p>3. Seeks and participates in professional and personal growth promoting activities</p>	<p>Annually in March APN 675 life-long learning assignment in personal portfolio</p> <p>APN 675 DB r/t professional organization</p>	<p>Operational Definition: Completion of life-long learning assignment documented in personal portfolio with successful completion (Will change to "with a score of at least 83%) and a DB r/t professional organization (with a score of at least 83%).</p> <p>Expected Level of Achievement/Decision Rule of Action: 90% of students will achieve at or above the operational definition</p>	<p><i>Fall 2014 APN675 Section 301 Assignment</i> <i>Life long learning:</i> n = 25 Scores ranged from 95-100. All scores were above benchmark of 90%.</p> <p>DB #6 <i>Section 301</i> n = 25 Scores 10/10 = 100% All scores were above benchmark of 90%.</p> <p><i>Spring 2015</i> <i>Section 301</i> <i>Assignment</i> <i>Life long learning:</i> n = 26. Scores ranged from 86-97. All scores above the benchmark of 90%, except for one.</p> <p><i>DB #6</i> <i>Section 301</i> n = 26. Scores ranged from 8-10. (80%-100%). Twenty-three at or above the benchmark of 88% and three less than the benchmark, earned 80%.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Faculty for APN 675 2. Results shared at monthly Assessment meeting within department via Faculty discussion
<p>8. Program Goal: Advocate</p> <p>1. Participates in activities</p>	<p>Annually in March APN 601</p>	<p>Operational Definition: Completion of the</p>	<p><i>Fall 2014 APN 601, Section 301</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Faculty for APN 601

<p>to improve health care practices and policies.</p> <p>2. Assumes the role of policy developer.</p> <p>3. Advocates for policy changes that promote health.</p>	<p>Perspective Project paper scores</p>	<p>Perspective Project paper with a 75% (83%) or better score</p> <p>Expected Level of Achievement/Decision Rule of Action: 90% of students will meet operational definition</p>	<p>n = 29. Scores on Project paper ranged from 112-140 = 80-100%. All scores above the benchmark of 75%.</p> <p><i>Section 302</i> N = 27. Scores on Project Paper ranged from 60-140 = 64% - 100%. One score below the benchmark of 75%.</p> <p><i>Spring 2015 APN 601 Section 301</i> N = 23. Scores on Project Paper ranged from 95 - 140 = 67% - 100%. Two scores below the benchmark of 75%.</p> <p><i>Section 302</i> n = 20. Scores on Project paper ranged from 114 - 140 = 81 - 100%. All scores above the benchmark of 75%.</p>	<p>2. Results shared at monthly Assessment meeting within department via Faculty discussion</p>
<p>9. Program Goal: Coordinator of Community Resources</p> <p>1. Coordinates care with others.</p> <p>2. Refers individuals, families, groups, communities, students, and organizations to appropriate resources.</p>	<p>Annually in April APN 670 Typhon entries reflect utilization of available resources appropriate to encounters. Successful completion is defined by 83% or greater on final Typhon evaluation.</p>	<p>Operational Definition: Successful completion of patient encounters reflected by final Typhon evaluation of 83% or greater.</p> <p>Expected Level of Achievement/Decision Rule of Action: 90% of the students will</p>	<p><i>Fall 2014 APN 670</i> n = 26. Scores on Final Typhon evaluation ranged from 40 - 50 = 80 - 100%. Two scores below the benchmark of 83%.</p> <p><i>Spring 2015 APN 670</i> n = 26. Scores on Final</p>	<p>1. Faculty for APN 670</p> <p>2. Results shared at monthly Assessment meeting within department via Faculty discussion</p>

3. Negotiates services for selected populations.		achieve at or above the operational definition	<p>Typhon evaluation ranged from 46.5 – 50= 93 – 100%. All scores Above the benchmark of 83%. One student failed course due to incomplete clinical hours.</p> <p>Meeting benchmark of 90% or greater meeting the expected level of achievement</p>	
<p>10. Program Goal: Knowledge Contributor</p> <p>1. Critically appraises published and unpublished nursing research.</p> <p>2. Contributes to nursing knowledge and evidence-based practice through validation, refinement, and extension of research.</p> <p>3. Applies, designs, conducts, and implements research to bring about change and make improvements in one's own professional environment.</p>	<p>Annually in April APN 697 EBP project manuscript score and submission of manuscript to peer reviewed journal.</p>	<p>Operational Definition: Successful completion of APN 697 project manuscript as evidenced by a score of 83% and mandatory submission for publication to peer reviewed journal.</p> <p>Expected Level of Achievement/Decision Rule of Action: 100% of students will achieve at or above the operational definition</p>	<p><i>Fall 2014 section 301 – 10 students. Average 93% = 100 points total</i></p> <p><i>Fall 2014 section 303 – 12 students. Average 101.5% average = 105 points total</i></p> <p><i>Spring 2015 All sections – 22 students. 94% average = 100 points total</i></p> <p><i>ALL students submitted to peer reviewed journal.</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Faculty for APN 697 2. Results shared at monthly Assessment meeting within department via Faculty discussion

* See <https://www2.indstate.edu/graduate/forms/review.pdf>.

If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit “tab” to add a new row.

Notes

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference.
- b. Each outcome must be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam must be included as one of the measures. At least one of the outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses.
- c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of “3” to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.”
- d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., “85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark).
- e. This may be a specific individual, a position (e.g., assessment coordinator), or a group such as the department assessment committee. Minutes should reflect that results are shared with members of the department at least annually.

Part Two

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students’ learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself; 2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator’s feedback on the previous summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

If you would like to reference any supporting materials (departmental meeting minutes, detailed assessment results, etc.), please provide the URL at which they can be found.

Part Two

Summarization

1. Discoveries assessment enabled faculty to make about students’ learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or assessment plan itself
 - a. Student learning
 - i. Overall students in the FNP concentration are meeting the identified benchmarks, with a few outliers.
 - ii. The Curriculum is offering students a variety of assessments to achieve the expected levels of learning outcomes
 - iii. Faculty discuss the assessment measurements, plan, outcomes, and results in-depth each month during the committee meetings and this process is effective in engaging faculty revising the plan for future assessment
 - b. Changes and improvements made or will make in response
 - i. For the Communicator program outcome, faculty discussed the applying other items from the evaluation tool for the next academic year assessment
 - c. For the 2016-2017 academic year, the assessment plan was not revised greatly. Faculty maintained that the plan achieved the measurements and benchmarks

Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University

Degree Program: MS in Family Nursing Practice Date: 8.2.16

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
<p>1. Student Learning Outcomes</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes are identified.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Curriculum Map was provided.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes were identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific and measurable.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are student-centered.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered program outcomes that span multiple learning domains.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization).</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes.</p>

				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.
2. Measures & Performance Goals	<input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.	<input type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct. <input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified. <input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course. <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced

				<p>exams, etc.) were provided that demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what students know/can do.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.</p>
3. Results	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the assessment process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.</p>
4. Engagement & Improvement	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and</p>

	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not clear and/or do not clearly connect to the results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.</p>	<p>in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.</p>	<p>implement plans to adjust activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.</p>
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 0 – Undeveloped	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 1 - Developing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 2 – Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 – Exemplary

COMMENTS**Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement****1. Learning Outcomes**

The faculty assessed twenty-nine (!) outcomes this past year. All of them are specific, clear, and measurable. I encourage you to consider opportunities to consolidate some related outcomes. Since each group is assessed by the same measure(s), you still could collect information about sub-outcomes if it were necessary.

2. Measures & Performance Goals

The program employs multiple measures (eleven altogether), including direct, high-impact activities such as clinicals and a portfolio. I did not notice an indirect measure: Are you planning to implement one? In most cases, sufficient detail is provided so that I can see their connection to the outcomes they purport to assess. But how would I know that the expanded SOAP notes specifically address the critical thinking outcomes? Can you give me a summary of what's included in the clinical evaluation tool? What exactly is required in the Typhon entries? And what is DB r/t professional organization? You get the idea. Though I would appreciate a bit more detail, I want to commend you on how rigorous these measures are. I also appreciate that some allow for mastery over time.

3. Results

Results are nicely detailed, except that semester-by-semester results are not totaled—it would help me to be able to tell at a glance that altogether, students met each benchmark. In any case, it appears that all standards were met. Do you use rubrics? Provide summaries of (and links to them) in your next report to clarify that results (and grades) tie directly to the outcomes.

4. Engagement & Improvement

Please identify the faculty members who collect and analyze data by name so that I can gauge the extent of their (very regular) participation. While Part One explains the numerical results of the program's assessments, Part Two contains only a brief, general discussion of students' performance and one proposed (and unclear) change to improve the communication outcome (though no specific weakness was identified). I would love to see more in depth reflection on and analysis of what you've learned from all the work you've done this year. Even when students achieve outcomes—as yours do—there always is room for improvement. What would you like to see your students do better? What will it take to make that happen? Overall, do you see evidence that learning is continuously improving?

Thanks for sharing this information about your assessment program. I look forward to learning more next year!