

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Feedback to Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2004-2005 Annual Reports

DEPARTMENT Microbiology and Immunology

DATE 08-29-06

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Ginny Guido & Barbara Voglewede

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u>X</u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |

Comments:

Undergraduate: n/a

Graduate: Nine objectives are presented. Considering that these are student learning outcomes for M.S. and PhD students, the objectives were written at a very beginning level of achievement. For example, students are to "learn to critically evaluate data" and "develop skills in oral communication. As these goals are written in such generic terms, it is difficult to see how they apply specifically to this program; they could apply to most programs at UND. Three of the objectives (#6-8) are plans of action as opposed to student learning goals.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

- | | | | |
|--|-----------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u>X</u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments:

Undergraduate: n/a

Graduate: The department assessment plan outlines the various assessment activities, which include only indirect assessment measures such as written and oral feedback from faculty, feedback from course directors, and evaluations by students taking the courses.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

- | | | | |
|--|-----------------|----------------|------------------------|
| Were any assessment results reported? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |
| • Were the results tied to goals for student learning? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |

Comments:

Undergraduate: n/a

Graduate: The departmental plan has a section addressing “What’s Changed” that begins to address what will be expected in relation to student learning outcomes. It is not always clear if these changes have occurred or will occur in the future.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?

YES _____ NO _____ QUALIFIED Y/N X _____

- If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?

YES _____ NO _____ QUALIFIED Y/N _____

Comments:

Undergraduate: n/a

Graduate: As mentioned above, it was unclear if assessment results have occurred or are expectations of what might occur in the future. In some instances, it does appear that one of the objectives was changed based on the assessment data; specifically that the department adopted policy to assure that all students knew of resources available to them for attendance at scientific meetings.

SUMMARY

Strengths

- X A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ____ Student learning goals are well-articulated.
- X Assessment methods are clearly described.
- X Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
- ____ Assessment methods are well-implemented.
- ____ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
- X Results are reported. (Some)
- ____ Results are tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

Areas for Improvement

- ____ No specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ____ Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
- ____ Assessment methods are not clearly described.
- ____ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
- X Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
- X A single type of assessment methods predominates.
- ____ No results are reported.
- X Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Overall, the assessment plan is sketchy and difficult to assess. As stated earlier, student outcomes goals were written in very generic and, at times, unmeasurable terms. Assessment methods incorporated merely indirect measures and the “closing the loop” actions were difficult to determine. This is one department that may benefit with working with a consultant on developing a more formal plan of assessment.

Reviewer(s):	Name	<u>Ginny Guido</u>	<u>Barbara Voglewede</u>	_____
	Department	<u>Nursing</u>	<u>Law</u>	_____
	Phone Number	<u>7-4543</u>	<u>7-2961</u>	_____
	e-mail	<u>ginnyguido@mail.und.edu</u>	<u>volgewede@law.und.edu</u>	_____

Section 1: _____ Section 2: _____ Section 3: _____ Section 4: _____

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well
- N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA = no information available
- ? = action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done