

## Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program Name (no acronyms): Medical Family Therapy

Department: Family and Community Medicine

Degree or Certificate Level: PhD

College/School: School of Medicine

Date (Month/Year): December/2022

Assessment Contact: Max Zubatsky

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? 2021-2022

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? 2021-2022

Is this program accredited by an external program/disciplinary/specialized accrediting organization? 2021

### 1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle? (Please list the full, complete learning outcome statements and not just numbers, e.g., Outcomes 1 and 2.)

Outcome I.A.1.: Students will demonstrate an expanded knowledge of theoretical and clinical practice in MFT, medical family therapy and integrative care.

Outcome I.B.1: Extend the knowledge base of MFT through original research and intellectual inquiry.

Outcome II.B.2: Contribute to the field through the development of effective teaching skills.

### 2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning

Which artifacts of student learning were used to determine if students achieved the outcome(s)? Please describe the artifacts in detail and identify the course(s) in which they were collected. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

The program uses multiple artifacts to evaluate student learning outcomes on a yearly basis. First, course evaluations and grades have been the most effective way to track outcomes. Every course has multiple graded assignments that determine specific competencies of students. Second, we use a Professional and Personal Evaluation to track maturity, professional competencies, and student development areas. Third, we have a Clinical skills evaluation to track benchmarks of clinical skills and application of course content into specific clinical work.

### 3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process

What process was used to evaluate the artifacts of student learning, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and **include them in/with this report document** (please do not just refer to the assessment plan).

The program has three main methods of evaluation. One method is through yearly advisor review meetings. The student reports all of their accomplishments and benchmarks of the program in their annual advisor document. The second assessment method is using Foliotek, a portfolio that tracks the student completing benchmarks in core program goals and learning objectives. There are specific assignments tied to each Foliotek section. Third, the student has a first year Personal and Professional Development Evaluation (PPDE). The PPDE serves as the initial competency evaluation in the program for students to pass.

#### 4. Data/Results

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcome(s)? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

The following are the results of the previous assessments of the learning outcomes. These outcomes are from all on-campus courses and learning from the previous year:

- All students have passed the core courses in the program
- All students who have participated in the portfolio examination (the pre-dissertation exam) have passed this qualifying exam
- All students have completed their clinical internship on time and have achieved above average reports from their supervisors.

#### 5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you?

The faculty have learned the following areas based on the results:

- Core and adjunct faculty are continuing to achieve student learning outcomes in coursework and helping students achieve high grades and assignment quality
- Students have been able to apply more of the student learning outcomes and course content into different internship areas of the program.
- The sequence of courses and teaching techniques continues to be effective in students achieving their outcomes and progression in the program.

#### 6. Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of Current Assessment Findings

A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss these results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

We share the results of student learning outcomes and assessments in three different areas. First, the program reviews the data from the program outcomes and all courses at the faculty retreat. The faculty reviewed the course grades, course evaluations, yearly surveys, and the advisor meeting review data. Second, we have our Communities of Interest, which are all of the faculty, collaborators, and stakeholders of the program to help review and provide feedback of our findings. Finally, in the summer of each year, the Program Director and Internship coordinator have the annual clinical site review meeting. Both faculty review the data and effectiveness of clinical sites for the progression of student's knowledge and skills.

B. How specifically have you decided to use these findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies

- Course content
- Teaching techniques
- Improvements in technology
- Prerequisites

- Course sequence
- New courses
- Deletion of courses
- Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings

Changes to the Assessment Plan

- Student learning outcomes
- Artifacts of student learning
- Evaluation process

- Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics)
- Data collection methods
- Frequency of data collection

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of these findings.

As a result of these findings, we have developed new courses and adjusted the course sequence of the program pedagogy (see 7A for the new course additions). We have made these two courses for advanced

student learning outcomes at the end of the second year in the doctoral program, and prior to students starting their internship. No changes to the assessment plans were made.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

## 7. Closing the Loop: Review of Previous Assessment Findings and Changes

A. What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years as a result of assessment data?

The program has implemented two new courses in the program within the past two years. The Teaching Skills in Medicine course was in response to students needing more competencies in teaching and preparing for future careers in healthcare and academia. The Community Health and Health Policy course was developed to meet more of the Outcome #3, where students get to learn more multicultural learning and training in community settings.

B. How has this change/have these changes been assessed?

The two new courses are assessed through both course grades and course evaluations.

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

The course grades were above average for all students in both courses. The course evaluations showed all high marks for the instructors for both courses.

D. How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

We will continue to track both course grades and evaluations by the program director and Department of Family and Community Medicine chair. The faculty will also look to continuous review information through frequent faculty meetings and smaller review committee meetings.

**IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools (e.g., artifact prompts, rubrics) with this report as separate attachments or copied and pasted into this Word document. Please do not just refer to the assessment plan; the report should serve as a stand-alone document.**