



**Program Assessment
Webinar**

**Joe Hawkins, M.S.Ed., CNMT
Program Director, AdventHealth University
April 11, 2019**

Notice

On April 29 some of the forms used in this presentation were updated by the JRCNMT. Updated versions of the forms have been inserted into this presentation.

Outline

- **Introduction and Disclaimer**
- **Overview of Assessment**
- **Sources of Data**
- **JRCNMT Forms**

Disclaimers

- **A fellow educator**
 - Do not speak for the board
 - No “gold standard”

PD for over 20 years at both a community college and a four-year university program.

Even though I am a board member, I do not speak for the board. I'm presenting this as a peer with expertise in education.

Examples are not a “gold standard”. There are many different ways of doing good program assessment.

Assessment

- **A definition**
 - **“Assessment is the systematic collection, review, and use of information about educational programs undertaken for the purpose of improving student learning and development.” (Palomba and Banta, 1999)**

Many definitions of assessment

This is a good definition since it explains WHY we do assessment – to improve student learning.

Assessment is also done to improve program quality.

Assessment

- **Another definition**
 - **“Assessment is the systematic collection of information about student learning, using the time, knowledge, expertise, and resources available, in order to inform decisions that affect student learning.” (Walvoord, 2010)**

very similar to previous....the focus is on student learning

Assessment

- **Emphasis in Higher Education**
- **We are already doing it**
- **Not a pass/fail**

A big push towards assessment (especially SLO's) by regional accrediting agencies

JRCNMT required program assessment in the previous standards but there is more emphasis in the new standards. There are also new forms to make it easier to document assessment.

Many other professional accreditors have similar forms to document program assessment.

We already do this on a regular basis but sometimes we don't document it

**This is not a pass/fail exercise...this is a process improvement cycle
- therefore it is ok to not meet every benchmark**

Resources

- **Institution**
 - Department or Office in college/university
 - Education office in hospitals
 - Other accredited programs
- **Books**
- **Online**
 - NILOA (learningoutcomesassessment.org)
 - AACU (aacu.org) – VALUE Rubrics

Most colleges have an office of assessment/institutional effectiveness. You may already be preparing an annual program assessment for this office.

Hospitals often have an education department that supports its academic programs.

Directors of other professionally accredited programs in your college or hospital can be a source of support.

Many books on assessment at the course, program, and institution level. Usually include chapters on writing SLOs. Some are listed on JRCNMT resource page

Online sources – NILOA webpage has a wide variety of information (white papers, research) on learning outcomes and their assessment as well as links to colleges/universities who do good assessment work

Association of American Colleges and Universities – has a series of rubrics for 16 different learning outcomes (critical thinking, oral/written communications, etc.). Can be used to grade papers/projects that include those learning outcomes

Sources of Data

- **Annual Program Reports**
 - Grad rates, pass rates, job placement
- **Course/instructor evaluations**
- **Faculty evaluations**
- **Student surveys (at graduation, during program)**
- **Graduate Surveys (post-board, 6-12 months)**
- **Employer Surveys**
- **Advisory Committee**
- **Clinical Site Visit documentation**

Where can you find sources of information for these forms? You may not have all of these and may have others not listed. These are just examples.

Sources of Data

- **Course assignments (papers, case studies)**
- **Clinical competencies**
- **Clinical evaluations**
- **Program/Department meeting minutes**
- **National surveys (Noel-Levitz, NSSE, etc.)**
- **Budget meeting minutes**

Course assignments (papers, etc.) – perhaps communication is a learning outcome of the program and your students write and present a paper or case study

Institutions often subscribe to national surveys (Noel Levitz or NSSE) that students are contacted to complete. Ask your assessment/IE office if any of these are done and how you can access data. Some questions are very broad and hard to apply to a particular program but other questions can be useful to individual programs.

Forms

- **Form J: APSLO**
 - Assessment of Program Student Learning Outcomes
- **Form L: PED**
 - Program Effectiveness Data
- **Form B: Resource Report**

JRCNMT has three forms that are used to do program assessment. Each form comes with instructions!!! Very beneficial to read them

Each one is completed every year....not just as a part of a self-study or mid-cycle report

Form J

Form J: Assessment of Program Student Learning Outcomes (APSLO)
Standard D1 and D2

Institution Name:		Academic Year in this Report:	
		Date of Report Completion:	

Program Mission: **TYPE MISSION HERE**

PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

	Outcome Statement	Assessment Method(s)	Date(s) of Assessment	Results and Analyses	Action Plan and Follow-Up
SLO #1		1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.
SLO #2		1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.

Form J – relates to Standard D1 and D2

Program mission – important to include since the program-level student learning outcomes must relate to the mission.

List all program-level SLOs – not individual course outcomes

Form J

- **Program Mission**

Program Mission

A program's mission statement may include concepts such as the types of students served, the program's responsibility to the community, the role of teaching or research, or a commitment to diversity. The mission of an academic program must align with the mission of the department and/or college it is housed within and the institution's mission.

This description of program mission comes from the JRCNMT website. There is a document addressing program mission and objectives in the "Self Study Forms and Directions" area of website

Form J

- **Program Outcomes not Course Outcomes**

Program Student Learning Outcomes

Program student learning outcomes (PSLOs) identify the purpose of the program and its curriculum. For consistency in its documents, the JRCNMT will refer to these as PSLOs but it is recognized that some institutions use the term program goals instead.

Identifying appropriate outcomes advances the program toward fulfilling its mission. Outcomes are stated operationally and identify the knowledge, skills and attitudes students are expected to acquire in the academic program. They are defined in further detail in course-level learning outcomes.

Example

The nuclear medicine graduate will:

OR

The nuclear medicine technology program will graduate students who can:

- *Integrate ethical decision-making into clinical practice.*
- *Appreciate the necessity and difficulty of making ethical choices.*
- *Become future leaders in nuclear medicine technology.*

Form J is for program SLOs, not individual course outcomes

“program SLOs”- identify the knowledge, skills, and attitudes students are expected to acquire in the academic program

“increasing enrollment” or “providing the state with competent nuclear medicine technologists” may be program goals, but they are not SLOs

Program SLOs

- **Should be aligned with institutional SLOs and mission**
- **Institutional administration may provide guidance on the level of expected alignment**

Form J

Program Mission: TYPE MISSION HERE

PROGRAM STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

	Outcome Statement	Assessment Method(s)	Date(s) of Assessment	Results and Analyses	Action Plan and Follow-Up
SLO #1		1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.
SLO #2		1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.

Need to list all program SLOS (add or subtract rows if needed)

Assessment method- each SLO should be assessed using at least one method but it may be done using multiple methods (add or subtract numbers if need be)

Date – annually, quarterly, twice per year, or can be a specific date

Results – append collated data (survey summaries, meeting minutes) to the document as evidence

Action plan/follow up – Identify what will be done. Also describe how anything already implemented has worked thus far.

Form J

SLO #4	Integrate professional skills with ethical and moral values.	1. Clinical Evaluation – professional ethics (using a 4-point scale)	1. Spring trimester	1. All students received a score of 3 or 4 (on a 1-4 scale)	1. The target (all scores are 3 or 4) was met. Will continue to measure and investigate additional assessments that can be used for this outcome.
---------------	--	--	---------------------	---	---

An example of ethical/moral SLO and how it was assessed

Form L (Standard D3.1)

Form L: Program Effectiveness Data (PED) Standard D3.1

Institution Name:	Academic Year in this Report:
	Date of Report Completion:

Data Source	Program's Benchmark	Date(s) of Assessment	Results and Analyses	Action Plans with Time Lines
Graduation rate		1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.
Graduate performance on national certification examinations	≥ 80% pass rate for rolling 5-year average for each exam	1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.
Graduate job placement		1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.
Faculty retention		1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.
Student evaluation of individual didactic courses, clinical experiences and faculty		1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.
Graduate assessment of program effectiveness		1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.
AES assessment of student performance		1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.
Employer assessment of graduate preparedness to enter the workforce		1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.
Advisory Committee feedback		1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.
Affiliate visit notes of PD/CC		1. 2.	1. 2.	1. 2.

The standard is pretty much unchanged from the previous standards. The difference is there is a form to fill in rather than narratives to write.

Benchmarks – narrative for D3.1 required a description of how each benchmark was set. Don't forget to provide the explanation in the associated narrative.

Results – collated data available for review at the site visit. You will not submit the supporting evidence with your compliance report.

Form L

Employer assessment of graduate preparedness to enter the workforce	3.5 in all 7 areas (on a 5-point scale)	May 2018 (1 year after graduation)	General NM – 4.4 Nuclear Cardiology – 4.4 PET – 4.3 Patient Care – 4.5 Radiation Protection – 4.4 Acquisition/Processing – 4.3 Equipment Operation and QC – 4.3	Employers are satisfied with graduates' performance in the workforce. Due to small number of graduates, we will continue to urge employers to complete surveys
---	---	------------------------------------	---	--

Example of employer survey results reported in the table.

Form B Resource Report

- **Program evaluates the adequacy of its resources each academic year**
- **Involves multiple standards (mostly B)**
 - **Review standard for each to ensure you address the full breadth of the issue**

Form B

Form B: Resource Report
Standard B

Institution Name:	Academic Year in this Report:
	Date of Report Completion:

Resource	How is adequacy reviewed?	Frequency of Review	Results for Identified Academic Year	Action Plan and Follow-Up
Program Director & Clinical Coordinator				
Instructional Faculty				
Support Staff				
Financial				
Office, Class & Lab Facilities				
Library, Technology and Other Educational Resources				
Clinical Affiliates				

Resource adequacy can be assessed through multiple methods. A few examples are listed below:

- The adequacy of clinical affiliates may be assessed at faculty meetings, Advisory Committee meetings and through student surveys about the clinical education experience.
- The adequacy of the program's financial resources may be evaluated at a budget meeting.
- Library resources may be addressed through an annual request for new books from the library with the outcome being whether any of the NMT program's requests were selected for purchase in a particular year.

Form B

Office, Class & Lab Facilities	B1.1d, B1.1e, C7	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Course/instructor evaluations (classroom conducive to learning) Noel-Levitz survey questions 72 and 82 (campus maintenance and study space) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> each trimester April 2018 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> average scores ranged from 3.6 to 4.0 (on a 4-point scale) #72 – 6.70 (6.30 ADU, 5.72 Four Year Private) #82 – 6.12 (5.68 ADU – campus question, no national comparison) (on a 7-point scale) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The course/instructor evaluation may be changing and no longer include a question on the classroom. We plan on adding a question on facilities on our Immediate Graduate Survey NM Program facility scores exceeded ADU averages which also exceeded the national comparison group. This will continue to be used every two years when Noel-Levitz is administered
---	------------------	--	--	--	---

It's important to show the scale for the scores you provide. Notice the second column from the right where the program presents its score and what the scale is (i.e. on a 4-point scale).

Disclaimer

- **These are just examples. The JRCNMT does not want to be overly prescriptive on what assessments can be used.**
- **These examples are in no way being shown as “gold standards”**

Advice

- **Follow directions on forms**
- **Identify all sources of possible program data**
- **Seek guidance from institutional support offices and your peers**
- **Ensure that program SLO's are NOT course objectives**
- **Assessment is a continuous improvement process, not a one-time pass/fail process**

The logo for JRCNMT is centered within a white rectangular area. The text "JRCNMT" is rendered in a bold, italicized, sans-serif font. The "JRC" portion is in a light gray color, while the "NMT" portion is in a dark blue color. A dark blue horizontal bar is positioned above the text, and another dark blue horizontal bar is positioned below it. The entire white area is enclosed in a thin black border.

JRCNMT