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**Comments**

 **Set Up**For the 2013-2014 year, Nuclear Medicine volunteered to participate in a pilot test where they were tasked to complete a new annual assessment form. Nuclear Medicine was provided no guidance and asked to complete the form in an effort to see which portions of the form caused the most confusion.

**Results**

* Outcomes Portion of Form Needs Clarification – The biggest confusion was evident in the outcomes portion of the form. Overall, all of the form’s questions were answered correctly, but the department experienced issues putting outcomes in the correct section of the form.
	+ **Plan:** Instructional departments will need more training on outcomes vs. goals and on forming benchmarks.
* Departments Need Assistance with Elaboration/Providing Explicit Information –Departments know what they would like to accomplish (e.g. “encourage students to seek employment outside of Amarillo”), but seldom provide a game plan for how they will accomplish their desired task.
	+ **Plan**: Departments need information on how to transition SMART goals to SMART action plans.

**Pilot Form Stored Location**
<https://www.actx.edu/archives/index.php?module=pagesmith&uop=view_page&id=37>

**Pilot Form Evaluation**

**2013-2014 Instructional Review Pilot**

**Evaluation Sheet**

**Review Evaluated:**  Nuclear Medicine

**Review Evaluation Date:** November 3, 2014

**Evaluation Completed by:** Members of Non-Instructional Assessment Committee

1. Did the department complete the sections required for this year’s review (I, II, IV, and VI)? [x]  Yes [ ]  No

If no, which response/s are incomplete (incomplete sentence, unanswered question, etc.)?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. **Section IV, Part B**: Did the department provide at least one direct outcome statement? [x]  Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Maybe

If no, what is the plan of action?

|  |
| --- |
| A few tweaks were made to where your information was located, but overall, nice job. |

1. This year’s evaluation is focused on outcomes and completion. However, are there areas in the review that the department should address before submitting next year’s review (e.g. lack of evidence, lack of clearly stated action plan, etc.)? [ ]  Yes [x]  No

If yes, what needs to be addressed before next year’s review?

|  |
| --- |
| Note: On your next review, there are some areas where you could be more explicit (e.g. how will you “encourage students to seek employment outside of Amarillo”?)Also, based on information provided in your review, some information was edited for you. |

**Key Terms Focused on in this Review:**

* **Outcome Statement:** Outcomes should be measurable. The statement should ideally include the audience, behavior, condition, degree (i.e. benchmark), and evaluation method.
* **Direct Outcomes:** Evidence of a change in a student, client, or customer’s knowledge, skills, expertise, attitude, or behavior as a result of a department’s intervention. A direct outcome is not subjective (e.g. survey, focus group, or interview).