

Assessment Committee
March 26, 2007
Large Faculty Conference Room

Members present: Noni Threinen (**Chair**), Mary Berg, Jane Richardson, Pat Casello, Don Eggebrecht, Xianhui Yang, Rachel Preisinger

Absent: Renee DeVries, Kren McManus, Angie Przybylski, Alyssa Hitch

Review October 17, 2006 Meeting Minutes:

Motion to Approve (Berg, Eggebrecht)

Approved with no abstentions

Announcements

We have not met as a committee since October because we completed the Outcome Criteria and are now awaiting the action of individual programs. The Program Annual Assessment Reports are due next week and will be discussed by the UAC next term.

Today's meeting was called to discuss a curriculum assessment model that Dr. Percuoco of Palmer College of Chiropractic shared with Dr. Threinen at a recent conference.

Annual Assessment Reports

- Once Annual Assessment Reports have been submitted to Dr. Threinen by each of the program Deans, she will divide assign each UAC member one of the reports to review, as was done last year. Each reviewer will be asked to answer a list of questions about the document assigned to him/her. We will discuss the documents as a committee and will then make a general recommendation about the format, etc. of the reports.
- These reports serve a purpose for each program, but should also serve a purpose for the university as a whole. Upon reading these reports, an outsider should be able to tell exactly where Northwestern is in the assessment process.

Discussion:

- We should each look at the same program's report as we were assigned last year so that we can compare our rubric critiques from year to year.

Action Item - Dr. Threinen will send the rubric to all UAC members to request their feedback.

Action Item - UAC members will create descriptions for each end of the rating scale used on the rubric.

Action Item - Rachel will look through minutes to find out which members were assigned to each program report last year. She will report back to the committee at our next meeting.

- There is also a Chiropractic Assessment Subcommittee. This committee should be advising the Chiropractic Annual Assessment Report.
- This is our 5th year of the assessment process. By this point we should be making progress on “closing the loop.” We as a committee can give suggestions on how to do this.

Palmer College Curriculum Assessment Powerpoint

- Dr. Robert Percuoco, Assistant VIPAA for Assessment at Palmer College of Chiropractic, has sent us his powerpoint slides describing the model of Curriculum Assessment currently in place at Palmer. Since Palmer only has one program, the assessment model deals only with Chiropractic Curriculum.
- NWHSU’s current assessment plan is working, but we need to determine how to “close the loop.”
 - o What does this mean for how we map our programs?
 - o What information are we using to make decisions?
- It is the responsibility of faculty to ask these questions within their programs. We, as an oversight committee, can make recommendations.
- We have a new online tool called *Survey Monkey*, which could enable us to look at trends, show deviation from standards, and map who is teaching what and when.
- The UAC can discuss programs and what faculty expect to see change over time.

Powerpoint Slides

- Palmer College of Chiropractic worked with Susan Hatfield, who did assessment workshops with all faculty members. They met weekly to discuss benchmarks and how guidelines were being met in the curriculum.
- Palmer aligned their CCEs (similar to our University Learning Outcomes) with their Palmer Chiropractic Abilities. Northwestern has a detailed table of all Competencies in LiveText. This table should be moved to a more accessible location so that we can begin to work with it. We have not covered the alignment of the Outcomes and Competencies as thoroughly as Palmer has done.
- Also included in the powerpoint slides is a comparison between Susan Hatfield’s model of assessment and Gloria Rogers’ model of assessment (see page 5 of slides). In looking at the Susan Hatfield model, we can see that all Northwestern is missing at this point is the benchmarks. The Rogers model is basically a detailed version of our “Plan-Do-Assess-Improve” cycle.

- On page 10 of the slides, Dr. Percuoco has mapped the three components that are routinely measured to evaluate the level of achievement of each learning competency. These three components are:
 - o Live Patient QE (comparable to the DA Exam for Chiropractic and the MCAOM Preclinical Exam) – *direct psychomotor measure of learning*
 - o NBCE Exam (National Boards) – *written exam*
 - o Senior Survey (NWHSU Alumni Survey could be adapted to include learning competency questions) – *indirect measure of students' perception of their own learning*
- Appropriate benchmarks are set for each of these criteria, based on the grade level of the student. If the average graduate outcome levels do not meet the benchmarks in two of the three assessments, the learning criteria in question will be reevaluated.
- The QE (DA Exam) at Palmer uses a scoring rubric similar to the one used here. However, Palmer does not use the QE scale subjectively as we do here. Instead, ratings are kept standard, but lower rating expectations are given for students at earlier points in the program (i.e. at T5, students should meet level 2 or above, while at T9, students should meet level 5). This type of rating creates greater inter-rater reliability.
- The QE Form also provides a space for comments from the evaluator. In this way, the test serves as an information base at the program level as well as a way of providing formative feedback directly to the student.

Next Steps at NWHSU

- The missing pieces for NWHSU are as follows:
 - o Connection to program criteria
 - o Establishment of benchmarks
 - o Circulation of assessment information back to the programs.
- In order for us to achieve what Palmer has put into place, we will all need to do a lot of work outside of meetings. If people are going to be assigned this task, they need to be well informed about the topic. At Palmer, all of those involved in this planning process read and discussed the entire book used as a reference.
- This is something we should aim to achieve within the next year. Our Criteria are already defined, now we need to match up our each program's criteria to these. Mapping our Learning Outcomes to each course should be a relatively easy task for us, since our Outcomes have been well-defined. This process will also be a helpful foundation to prepare us for the accreditation process.
- It is also important to keep in mind that we need not implement each outcome every year. Instead, we should focus on one or two outcomes (as we are doing) and cycle through the eight every four years. In this way we will continue to return to each one without being spread too thin.
- We still need to define outcome criteria at the program level.

Action Item - We will move the Excel table out of livetext and Rachel will make it available on the CTLA website.

Action Item - Dr. Threinen will send the Assessment reports to UAC members for review. Call her with any questions.

Motion to Close (Yang)

Meeting adjourned at 1:04pm.

Minutes submitted by: Rachel Preisinger

Approved by: _____

Noni Threinen, D.C., Chair
University Assessment Committee