

# UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

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

DEPARTMENT \_\_\_\_\_ Space Studies \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_ April 4, 2006 \_\_\_\_\_

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW \_\_\_\_\_ Lana Rakow, Garl Rieke \_\_\_\_\_

### 1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- |                                       |         |        |                  |
|---------------------------------------|---------|--------|------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced?          | YES_G__ | NO__   | QUALIFIED Y/N __ |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES__   | NO_G__ | QUALIFIED Y/N __ |
| • Do goals address student learning?  | YES_G__ | NO__   | QUALIFIED Y/N __ |

#### Comments:

--This department only has a graduate program (G). **The Program is designed “....to provide a comprehensive world-class education in the academic areas of Space.”**  
--The assessment plan is well conceived, although goals are apparently left to be determined between the advisor and student. -  
--The annual report mentions four categories of objectives which are not referenced in the plan: cognitive, behavioral, affective, and satisfaction.

### 2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

- |  |       |      |                                  |
|--|-------|------|----------------------------------|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced?   | YES__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N __G, in the plan__ |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals?        | YES__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N __G, in the plan__ |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach? | YES__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N __G, in the plan__ |

#### Comments:

--The assessment methods are sprinkled throughout the assessment plan.  
--The annual report does not address assessment methods but the plan has a good mix of direct and indirect methods, including (indirect) surveys, comprehensive exams, and the capstone experience

### 3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

- |  |       |        |                  |
|--|-------|--------|------------------|
| Were any assessment results reported?  | YES__ | NO_G__ | QUALIFIED Y/N __ |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? | YES__ | NO__   | QUALIFIED Y/N __ |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?            | YES__ | NO__   | QUALIFIED Y/N __ |
| • Were the results tied to goals for student learning?   | YES__ | NO__   | QUALIFIED Y/N __ |

#### Comments:

The assessment plan tells how data is collected; however, no results are presented in the 2004 annual report; a 2005 annual report was not filed.

#### 4. CLOSING THE LOOP

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

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N \_G, in the plan\_

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

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N \_\_\_\_\_

#### *Comments:*

The assessment plan has a section of changes undertaken in response to feedback in 2002-2003. However, the annual report does not contain any data or discussion of actions taken.

#### SUMMARY

##### *Strengths*

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

#### OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

This department has a very good assessment plan, although learning goals are not specifically identified. The department's assessment activities are included in the overall report of the College with only a brief reference to Space Studies and no results or feedback for decision-making reported.

Reviewer(s):	Name	Lana Rakow	G. K. Rieke
	Department	School of Communication	Anatomy & Cell Biology
	Phone Number	7-0675	7-3713
	e-mail	<a href="mailto:lanarakow@mail.und.nodak.edu">lanarakow@mail.und.nodak.edu</a>	<a href="mailto:grieke@medicine.nodak.edu">grieke@medicine.nodak.edu</a>

Section 1: \_\_?\_\_ Section 2: \_\_Y/?\_\_ Section 3: \_\_N\_\_ Section 4: \_\_Y/?\_\_

#### 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