

General Assessment Issues Related to Forms J and L
JRCNMT 2021

Form J

1. Indicating students spent a total of X hours in a particular rotation or program activity does not objectively demonstrate that student learning occurred so a method such as this should not be used to demonstrate attainment of an SLO.
2. The literature in academic assessment consistently says that the average final score for all students in a particular course is not a valid indicator of student learning. This is because attendance, participation, extra credit and the like, which do not reflect learning, may be used to compute the final course grade. It is preferable to use a set of graded activities in the course or a comprehensive final exam as the assessment method to demonstrate learning.

Form L

3. A response rate on a survey or course evaluation is not an indicator of program effectiveness. The program may note that the response rate is low and in need of improvement, but it's the feedback on the surveys or evaluations that reflect program effectiveness. Response rate should never be the only assessment method identified for an item on Form L.
4. Explaining a graduation rate: rather than saying students did not meet program requirements, it's unclear whether the students were admitted without meeting admission requirements or the students failed to meet program advancement requirements and could not advance to the next semester. It's also suggested that the situation be explained, for example, "Attrition of 3 students - 2 dismissed for grades and 1 dismissed for failure to meet academic integrity code".
5. For the certification exam pass rate evaluated on Form L: ensure results are presented as the three-year average for first-time examinees for both exams as a combined number, computed by using the worksheet provided by the JRCNMT. Programs must use the JRCNMT's criteria of a three-year average for first-time examinees when providing pass rate results on this form.

Forms J & L

6. If a benchmark is met over consecutive years, a program should consider one of two actions. The benchmark should be raised or a different assessment parameter should be used to measure the item. The change will facilitate continuous improvement and prevent the program from becoming complacent or stagnant.
7. Benchmarks must be clear. For example, a benchmark that states "minimum of 50 for each student" is unclear. Does it refer to a score of 50% or is it 50 out of some total number of points (i.e., 50 out of 75). Responses should be specific.
8. Results must be presented in the format stipulated in the benchmark. If the program sets a benchmark as a rolling five-year average, the results must be presented as a five-year average. Providing a single year average does not permit the reviewer or the program to determine whether the benchmark, noted as a five-year average, was met.
9. If a benchmark is stated as "80% or higher", it is appropriate to provide the actual percentage attained rather than stating the result as "80% or higher was achieved".
10. "Continue to monitor" should not be a standard action plan for all SLO or program effectiveness measures. An issue may need to be monitored over a few years to determine whether it's a one-time occurrence but prolonged monitoring is not acceptable.