

Doisy College of Health Sciences
2021-2022 Program Level Assessment: Annual Report

Department:

PLO #2: The Screening/assessment Activities were reviewed by MRI faculty utilizing a rubric for the assignment Preceptor Evaluations from the Mid & Final rotation evaluations and the program assessment plan rubric

PLO #3: Critical reflections were assessed by program faculty utilizing a rubric for the assignment Critical reflection instructions were edited for this year with scheduled topics. The topics included "Cura Personalis, ethics, and professionalism.

PLO #4: The Capstone Papers were critiqued by program faculty for content and format following prescribed parameters and the program assessment plan rubric. The Capstone presentations were critiqued by program faculty members and MRI Advisory Board members for content and format following prescribed parameters (Appendix) and the program assessment plan rubric

Committee shares information and seeks resolutions for issues with clinical practicum and is a great resource for information sharing.

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 | Course content |
| Pedagogies | Teaching techniques |
| | Tc 0 Tw 25.587 02.542 |

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.*

For DCHS Programs

If you choose to copy/paste items from the list above * and those below^, clearly label them within the Word document.

29. _____ Follows isolation protocols
30. _____ Checks for metallic or ferromagnetic objects before entering MR suite
_____ **TOTAL/30 = _____ AVERAGE SCORE**

Mid Rotation Evaluation

(circle one)

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. The student understands the objectives of the rotation. | Y | N |
| 2. The student's understanding of exams coincides with the level of the rotation. | Y | N |
| 3. The student is actively pursuing the requirements to complete the rotation. | Y | N |
| 4. The student is displaying motivation in per | | |

will result in a decrease of the student's clinical grade.

Prompts for each critical reflection

Rotation 1: Due 2/6/2022

Jesuit Values

What are Jesuit Values?

How have you seen "Cura Personalis" reflected in the clinical setting?

Rotation 2: Due 4/3/2022

Professional characteristics of a MRI technologist

Provide examples of portrayal (good and bad) of the professional characteristics mentioned in your reflection.

Rotation 3: Due 5/24/2022

Ethical Dilemma

Have you witnessed an ethical dilemma or been involved in one personally during your time in the clinic? If not, please provide thoughtful comments on what good and bad ethics may be and how they would affect the profession and or others.

Rotation 4: Due 7/18/2022

Professional Development

Describe your progress as an MRI technologist. Think back to the first rotation and how you felt and compare to the fourth rotation as you are completing the program.

Entries are NOT to be written during clinical time.

Critical Self -Reflection Grading Rubric

	0- Beginner	1-Developing	2-Accomplished (Reflections 1 -4; Maximum Points Available = 10)	Comments	3-Advanced (Reflections 5 -8 ; Maximum Points Available = 15)	Co
Identifies and Summarizes Issue <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not identify or summarize issue.	Minimally identifies and summarizes issue.	Identifies and summarizes issue. Explores some aspects of the issue.		Identifies and summarizes issue comprehensively. Explores all aspect of the issue.	
Gathers facts and evidence related to issue <input type="checkbox"/>	Only uses facts or evidence present at the onset of the issue. Does not seek out additional information.	Seeks and gathers minimal information related to issue from few or inappropriate sources.	Seeks and gathers ample additional information from a variety of sources.		Generates comprehensive set of facts/evidence based information from a variety of credible sources.	
Incorporates perspectives <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not consider the other points of view when approaching issue.	Approaches issue based off of personal perspective and majority/popular points of view.	Approaches issue based off of other people's perspectives and opinions.		Utilizes all perspectives available when approaching issue. Distinguishes between facts and opinion when presenting evidence.	
Draws Conclusions <input type="checkbox"/>	Does not draw conclusions or formulates conclusions inconsistent with evidence and perspectives.	Formulate s some conclusions consistent with some evidence, but lacking in depth and scope .	Formulates conclusions consistent with most evidence.		Formulates conclusions consistent with a wide range of evidence.	

*Note on scoring methodology: Grade on criteria as indicated below, from 1 to 5. Please use whole numbers.

5 = Excellent 4 = Very Good 3 = Average 2 = Below Average 1 = Poor

Evaluation categories below are listed in descending merit: 5 is highest, 1 is lowest.

A. Project, global:

- 5 Project was a basic or primary scientific analysis of a subject important to MRI performed using background, hypothesis, methods, data acquisition, analysis, discussion, conclusion
- 4 Project involved data gathering or surveys and involved analysis, but lacked one or more of background, hypothesis, methods, data acquisition, analysis, discussion, conclusion
- 3 Subject examined in only a descriptive manner, but discussed new methods or materials AND subject is relevant to MRI
- 2 Subject was a review of previous material familiar to the audience
- 1 Subject had little relevance to MRI and is of little merit

B. Content:

- 5 Excellent scientific paper, student demonstrates good understanding of MRI science. Has background, hypothesis/premise, methods, results, analysis, conclusion, all with good merit
- 4 Project reflects an understanding of science of MRI, has a good knowledge of the subject, presentation has hypothesis (or premise), methods, results, analysis, conclusion
- 3 Project shows some understanding of subject matter relevant to MRI, but only average in respect to methods, results, analysis, conclusion
- 2 Project has minimal relationship to MRI science, had minimal discussion or analysis hence, minimal understanding of subject matter
- 1 No discernable science presented, little understanding of MRI science, little or no discussion or analysis or rational conclusion

C. Scientific Merit

- 5 Project is of significant scientific merit and worthy of outside presentation or submission for publication
- 4 Project shows good merit, but lacks in complete novelty
- 3 Project demonstrates some originality and attempt at discovery, but somewhat lacks in its achievement due to effort or complexity of subject
- 2 Project was a good idea at the start, but failed to achieve its goals and better luck next time
- 1 Project unoriginal, generally plagiarized, lacking rational thought and best kept in a locked file

D. Preparation and Presentation

- 5 Student is well prepared and understands the subject matter; presentation is well-designed with no errors
- 4 Student is prepared but presentation is weak, i.e. rushed, too jocular, spelling errors
- 3 Student is only somewhat prepared and presentation is faulty (slides out of order, computer problems)
- 2 Presentation is marginal, subject matter obscure, images not relevant, audience restless and confused
- 1 Presentation put together with minimal effort, material uncoordinated, slides show unorganized

