

DEPARTMENTAL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – EVALUATION RUBRIC

Department: Communication Sciences and Disorders Year: 2014	On Target 3	Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Department is expected to address:			
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined and is in alignment with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals with productivity directly linked to program enhancement	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning.	The program assessment plan is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program clearly demonstrates its value to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited or no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Note: Highlighted area indicates Program Review Committee's assessment for each area.

Degrees Offered – BA and MA in SLP, MA in SLP, AuD in audiology, PhD in SLP

Triggers – 1.75 graduates for PhD program

DEPARTMENTAL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – EVALUATION RUBRIC

Commendations:

- Accredited program and meeting accreditation standards.
- Heavy teaching load by faculty, but still producing high quality teaching and scholarship.
- High quality graduates as evidenced by their employment and licensing data.

Needs Going Forward:

- Inconsistency with reporting target/criteria and results; review and make more consistent for next 3 year review.
- Although triggered for low number of PhD graduates, the number is border-line. In order to grow PhD program it would be to the department's benefit to request appropriate facilities, faculty resources, and other appropriate tools to further advance this important program for the University. This will be more important as the University develops its innovation campus, as this program will likely be a major participant.

DEPARTMENTAL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – EVALUATION RUBRIC

Department: Dental Hygiene Year: 2014	On Target 3	Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Department is expected to address:			
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined and is in alignment with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals with productivity directly linked to program enhancement	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning.	The program assessment plan is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program clearly demonstrates its value to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited or no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Note: Highlighted area indicates Program Review Committee's assessment for each area.

Degrees Offered – BS in dental hygiene (entry level and degree completion)

Triggers – Triggered for faculty numbers

Commendations:

- Meeting learning objectives overall/outcomes, and when students fall below targets, a rationale is provided.
- Accredited program, meeting accreditation standards.

DEPARTMENTAL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – EVALUATION RUBRIC

- Even though faculty have high teaching loads, scholarship is still being completed by some faculty.
- Plans for moving the degree completion program to 100% online will be helpful to the professions and department.

Needs Going Forward:

- Align the student learning objectives with the outcomes more clearly.
- Consideration for adding more faculty resources will be important as the online option is added.

DEPARTMENTAL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – EVALUATION RUBRIC

Department: Medical Laboratory Sciences Year: 2014	On Target 3	Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Department is expected to address:			
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined and is in alignment with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals with productivity directly linked to program enhancement	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning.	The program assessment plan is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program clearly demonstrates its value to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited or no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Note: Highlighted area indicates Program Review Committee's assessment for each area.

Degrees Offered – BS in MLS

Triggers – Triggered for faculty numbers

Commendations:

- Accredited program and meeting accreditation standards.

DEPARTMENTAL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – EVALUATION RUBRIC

- Evidence demonstrating the quality and productivity of the faculty, even with a limited number of faculty.

Needs Going Forward:

- In terms of the mission, and for future 3 year reports, provide more detail about how the mission has changed and the influences that brought about these changes.
- Develop a plan to ease the difficulties associated with a heavy teaching load that prevents scholarly activities.
- In terms of learning outcomes, more descriptive information should be given on numbers of students, use of the data to make improvements. Comments such as “continue to respond to suggestions and comments of evaluators to improve program” do not describe what is actually being done.
- On target with their feedback loop, but more description and clarification on how assessment data is used to make changes.

DEPARTMENTAL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – EVALUATION RUBRIC

Department: Nursing Year: 2014	On Target 3	Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Department is expected to address:			
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined and is in alignment with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals with productivity directly linked to program enhancement	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning.	The program assessment plan is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program clearly demonstrates its value to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited or no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Note: Highlighted area indicates Program Review Committee's assessment for each area.

Degrees Offered – BS in Nursing (BSN); MS in Nursing (MSN); and Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

Triggers – None

Commendations:

- Accredited program and meeting accreditation standards.

DEPARTMENTAL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – EVALUATION RUBRIC

- Evidence demonstrating the quality and productivity of the faculty.
- Meticulous assessment process.
- Efforts made toward competency based learning.

Needs Going Forward:

- It is important to develop a plan to address technology support for graduate online programs.
- It is critical to have a marketing plan (with funding) to improve demand for graduate nursing programs, i.e., MSN, DNP.
- Paying market level salaries to faculty continues to contribute to faculty recruitment and retention issues. This was pointed out in the last review, but it's not clear that a solution has been initiated.
- We assume service is on target, but the data was not included in the report.

DEPARTMENTAL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – EVALUATION RUBRIC

Department: Physical Therapy Year: 2014	On Target 3	Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Department is expected to address:			
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined and is in alignment with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals with productivity directly linked to program enhancement	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning.	The program assessment plan is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program clearly demonstrates its value to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited or no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Note: Highlighted area indicates Program Review Committee's assessment for each area.

Degree Offered – Doctorate in Physical Therapy

Triggers – Triggered for faculty numbers

Commendations:

- Competitive applicant pool
- Students admitted with average GPA of 4.0 (2013) and all graduates are employed in their field.

DEPARTMENTAL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – EVALUATION RUBRIC

Needs Going Forward:

- Program placed on probation in 2013 for a lack of assessment processes/reporting. Program responded and now they are no longer on probation, but have work to do to improve program assessment. Plans are in place for this to happen.
- Review your program mission in relation to the new University mission. Program goals should be measurable.
- Program objectives and learning outcomes are mixed together on page 3 of the report. For the next report differentiate between the two and report the data separately. Tie the direct assessment measures with each outcome.
- The focus should be given to fill faculty vacancies and improve research equipment and space. Another focus should be to increase scholarly productivity, particularly grants.

DEPARTMENTAL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – EVALUATION RUBRIC

Department: Physician Assistant Year: 2014	On Target 3	Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Department is expected to address:			
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined and is in alignment with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals with productivity directly linked to program enhancement	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning.	The program assessment plan is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program clearly demonstrates its value to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited or no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Note: Highlighted area indicates Program Review Committee's assessment for each area.

Degrees Offered – Master – Physician Assistant

Triggers – Triggered for faculty numbers

Commendations:

- Accredited program meeting accreditation standards.
- The program has a national reputation, with an active and productive faculty in terms of teaching and scholarship.

DEPARTMENTAL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – EVALUATION RUBRIC

- Applaud the program for pointing out the decrease in student satisfaction numbers, but will expect an analysis in the next 3-year report.

Needs Going Forward:

- It will be important to develop a plan to address faculty retention, i.e., bringing faculty salaries up to market in order to recruit and retain qualified faculty.
- When reporting learning outcomes, target/criteria and analysis of the results is not provided (as required) and should be in future 3-year reports.
- NCCPA exam results reported by skill and tied to learning outcomes should be provided in future 3-year reports and the “n” should be provided.
- In terms of applicant data, when reporting data in narrative format and charts, make sure they are consistent. There are several inconsistencies in the report, e.g., the mission is not reported as changed on page 2, but on page 12 it was reported that it was updated. The timeframe dates on page 13 seem incorrect.
- It appears a feedback loop is used; however, it is not concisely identified in the document.

DEPARTMENTAL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – EVALUATION RUBRIC

Department: Public Health Sciences Year: 2014	On Target 3	Meets Expectations 2	Does Not Meet Expectations 1
Department is expected to address:			
Centrality of the program to fulfilling the mission and role of the institution	Program mission is clearly defined and is in alignment with university mission.	Program mission is clearly stated. The role of the program and relationship to the university mission is in general aligned with university mission.	Program mission is not stated or is not in alignment with university mission
Quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty	The document clearly reflects that faculty members are fully qualified to support the program goals with productivity directly linked to program enhancement	The document reflects that the strengths, productivity and qualifications of the faculty associated with the program are sufficient to sustain the program.	Faculty productivity and quality are not evaluated as sufficient to meet the needs of the program.
Quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students	The program assessment clearly shows both alignment and positive impact of the curriculum on student learning.	The program assessment plan is fully implemented and shows the alignment of the curriculum with student learning outcomes as they reflect the quality of student learning	The assessment plan does not align the curriculum with student learning outcomes or does not demonstrate the impact of the curriculum on student learning.
Demonstrated student need and employer demand for the program	The program clearly demonstrates importance based on employer need and student demand.	The program presents data that shows either employer demand or student need.	The program data does not indicate student need nor employer demand.
Service the program provides to the discipline, the university and beyond	The program clearly demonstrates its value to the discipline, to the university and to the community.	The program demonstrates value to the discipline, the university or the community.	The program does not demonstrate value to its discipline, the university and/or the community.
Evidence of feedback loop demonstrating program improvement	The program not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences. Shows significant program improvement as a result of feedback loop.	The program regularly uses data to evaluate student performance and the efficacy of its courses and programs. Changes made using assessments are documented, although results from those changes are yet to be seen.	The program makes limited or no use of data collected to evaluate the efficacy of its courses and programs.

Note: Highlighted area indicates Program Review Committee's assessment for each area.

Degrees Offered – BS in Services Management and Community Development (HSMCD); BS in Health Sciences; and MA in Aging Studies

Triggers – Triggered for the low number of faculty

Commendations:

- Mission statements clearly defined.
- SCH significantly increased over the last 3 years.

DEPARTMENTAL PROGRESS TOWARD ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM – EVALUATION RUBRIC

- Productive faculty in terms of scholarship, except grants have decreased.

Needs Going Forward:

- Review student learning assessment process. Develop measurable objectives and learning outcomes. Clearly align the student learning objectives with the outcomes. Develop direct assessment measures (e.g., a rubric for evaluation) for all levels and degree programs. A course grade is not considered a direct assessment tool.
- Clearly demonstrate in your next program review that the results of student learning objectives are monitored and used as a part of continuous improvement process involving all departmental faculty
- Provide analysis of the assessments and establish the feedback loop for continuous improvement of the programs.
- Have a sustainable succession plan to address faculty needs. Programs do not appear to be sustainable with current faculty mix.