

May 19, 2006

Student Outcomes Assessment Committee (OAC) 2005-2006 Annual Report

The OAC for the 2005 and 2006 academic year was chaired by Dr. M-H. Wang. The committee includes Drs. S. Sherida (Student Office), E. Shek (Pharm Sci), A. Gaylor (Pharm. Prac). J. Epps was invited to join the 2005/06 committee to help with the transition to the new committee. Dr. D. Allen acts as the Dean's representative. C. Root serves as secretary assistant.

The committee carried out the duties and responsibilities defined in the bylaws and implemented five charges by the Dean. The committee meets every month to conduct the regular business and to determine any issues related to the student outcomes assessment. The committee's activities are summarized into the two parts as follows;

Part A: Assessment timeline and Implementation for assessing Communication Skills:

1. **Set the 2005/06 Outcomes Assessment Exam timeline:** The annual assessment day was scheduled on February 14 (Tuesday), 2006. The date was chosen to give students and faculty an adequate time to prepare and to be ready for the assessment.
2. **Determining the assessment areas in line with the TTUHSC Top Seven Ability Statements.** Three parts of the competency areas, written communication skill, verbal communication skill, and traditional multiple choice, were assessed this year. The multiple choice assessment was delivered using the WebCT quiz program. This was the first time to use WebCT as the tool for examination. In general, the WebCT quiz program successfully delivered the test even though there are several technical problems during the assessment. The written communication skill assessment was graded by the TTU Writing Center with scores ranging from 1 to 6. The average score for P1, P2, P3 and P4 is 3.5, 3.7, 3.6, and 4.1 respectively. Because of technical problems, the cut score for written communication skill was not determined. The assessment for the verbal communication skill adapted a new grading system. Even though the cut score was not developed, the outcomes seem to reflect the levels of the students in commending verbal communication skills. The average score for P2, P3 and P4 students is 92.5, 86, and 88, respectively.

Suggestions to improve the outcomes assessment in the next year for the incoming committee have been outlined in the OAC 2005/06 Activities Update. One of the major tasks is to develop the cut score for both written and verbal communication skill assessments.

Part B: Five Charges for 2005/06 Committee Year by the Dean:

1. **Develop a plan to conduct a longitudinal assessment of abilities:** Upon discussing this charge, the committee members agreed that the current OX Exam is weighted heavily on

assessing knowledge but not skills and abilities, although communication skill assessment is on the way. After detailed discussion, the committee believed that establishment of an ability performance system should allow us to objectively assess the skills and knowledge that students possess. The reference from the Idaho State pharmaceutical performance form is a good start. The committee has outlined several areas in line with the TTUHSC TOP Seven ability statements that should be considered and developed. It is determined to adapt the model from Idaho State pharmaceutical performance system with modifications and gradually incorporates it into our current assessment system.

2. **Execute the four-year plan to review all ability statements in the competency areas being tested for in the Annual Outcomes Assessment examination:** The OAC has reviewed and discussed in detail how to implant this charge. In consulting with Dr. Allen, it was agreed that the 195 ability statement will be divided into the four blocks according to the levels of the student (P1 to P4). Block 1 includes P0 to P1 ability statements, which will be reviewed and improved by the 2005/06 committee. Block 2 includes P2 ability statements, which will be reviewed and improved by the 2006/07 committee. Block 3 includes P3 ability statements, which will be reviewed and improved by the 2007/08 committee. Block 4 include P4 ability statements, which will be reviewed by the 208/09 committee. It was determined that committee members will review each ability statement during the regular monthly meeting. The revised ability statement will be forward to the SOP faculty for approval.
3. **Continue to implement the oral and written communications assessment with a goal of making it count... in Spring 2006:** The assessment for the oral (verbal) communication skill was discussed and implemented in the Annual Assessment Exam in February 14, 2006. The main issues are the grading system and the cut score. With previous experience and other references, Drs. S. Nelson and A. Gaylor have developed a relatively objective grading system to evaluate the oral communication skills during a 15 min assessment period. This system basically reflects the levels of student in converting clinical interview skills to patients in a patient-oriented model. However, because of the complexity in judging the skillfulness of the communication, the cut score was not determined. For the assessment of the written communication skill, the committee feels that scenario provided to students is adequate. The assistance and support from he TTU Writing Center was significant plus for us to grade the skillfulness of the writing skills in terms of clarity and fairness. Considering the multiple factors, the cut score for the assessment of the written communication skill was determined.
4. **Make a recommendation to the faculty to making the OS Exam “high Stakes” with a plan to phase the “high stakes’ nature....timetable for implementation:** The committee has discussed this change in detail several times. Various opinions were also gathered from faculties through email and other communication methods. The committee believed that making the OA Exam ‘high Stakes is an urgent issue and should be implemented according the planned timetable. The committee has developed a draft with a timetable and provides sufficient evidence to support such an action. Nevertheless, the proposed OA Exam “high Stakes” was not approved in the SOP faculty meeting. The

critical issues were the significance of the OX Exam in comparison with the regular exams the students take every year and the remedies for the students that fail the test. The 2005/06 committee has not revisited the issue after the SOP faculty meeting.

5. **Follow up on ACPE site visit recommendation and Council Requirements:** The committee has discussed issues related to the ACPE site visit. The committee believed that the outcomes assessment program currently implemented in the SOP is adequate and meet the standard. It is clear from the mission of the SOP, the focus of the outcomes assessment is equally on the two areas: acquisition of knowledge and application of knowledge and skills. During the ACPE site visit, the chair of the committee met the site visit members and conveyed our effects to them. One example is the implantation of oral and written communication skills in the OA Exam. The feedback from the Site visit group is positive in evaluating the works performed by the SOP' outcomes assessment program.

Ming-Hai Wang, M.D., Ph.D.
Chair, the 2005/06 Outcomes Assessment Committee

Submitted Electronically by Committee Chair
5/19/06