

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Feedback to Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2005-2006 Annual Reports

DEPARTMENT: Physical Education & Exercise Science (PEXS) DATE: 2/2/07

COMMITTEE MEMBERS CONDUCTING REVIEW: Barbara Combs and 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> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |

In addition to the Departmental goals, please also consider UND's Institutional and General Education goals for student learning (shown in alignment within parentheses). For each goal, use a Y (yes), N (no), or ? (qualified y/n or uncertain) to indicate whether this department has a similar or related goal.

<u>?(UG)/Y(G)</u>	1 Communication ("communicate effectively, both orally and in writing")
<u>N(UG)/Y(G)</u>	2 Critical/creative thinking ("think critically and creatively" and "be intellectually curious and creative")
<u>N</u>	3 Informed choices ("make informed choices")
<u>N(UG)/Y(G)</u>	4 Understanding across disciplines ("understand how conclusions are reached in the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the arts and sciences" and "acquire knowledge over a broad spectrum of subject areas")
<u>N</u>	5 Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelong learning")
<u>N</u>	6 Cross-cultural appreciation ("develop some familiarity with cultures other than their own")
<u>N</u>	7 Service/citizenship ("commit themselves to...the service of others," and "share responsibility both for their communities and for the world")

Comments regarding Departmental goals and alignment of Departmental Goals with Institutional and Gen Ed Goals:

Undergraduate:

The first student learning goal is not stated in the plan, although the first underlying objective (passing a comprehensive exam) is. (However, as of 04-05 the implementation of the exam was still under discussion and the department had not yet decided on using it as an assessment measure.) It would have been more helpful if the plan had addressed what that overall goal actually is – for example, "to gain a comprehensive knowledge of physical education and exercise science."

There are two other goals stated in the plan – one relating to the student's ability to apply his/her knowledge, and the other related to the student's lifelong commitment to physical health. Regarding the latter, however, the goal and its objectives lack any reference to lifelong commitment to the physical health of *others*, which would seem to be an important part of the overall mission of the program. Further, the objectives for this goal do not appear to target a lifelong commitment, but rather a commitment of the student only while in the program.

Considering the department's mission, which also stresses developing the student's ability to synthesize and research, the plan lacks a goal targeting those competencies, specifically. (And if the plan contemplates those competencies under the broader first goal "gaining knowledge" or second goal "applying knowledge," it would be helpful to see those competencies specifically recognized under either or both of those goals.)

In terms of how the plan's goals relate to the UND institutional and Gen Ed goals, the plan doesn't seem to incorporate those larger institutional goals. There might be some implied overlap – for example, between UND goal 1 and PEX goals 1 & 2 (and more specifically, Gen Ed goal 1 and PEX tasks 2.1, 2.2, or 2.5); UND goal 4 and PEX goal 1; UND goal 5 and PEX goal 2; and UND goal 6 and PEX objective 2.5 – but the plan does not explicitly indicate any relationship with those goals.

Graduate:

The 2006 annual report makes reference to a department plan for both graduate and undergraduate programs. The department graduate program is listed as Kinesiology on the assessment plans page, which causes some initial confusion because the graduate program in Kinesiology is located within the Department of Physical Education and Exercise Science, rather than being its own separate department. Learning goals for the graduate program, with the exception of Goal 5, are clearly stated. Goal 5 is still being developed. Goals 1-4 address student learning. While not explicit, it could easily be implied that these listed goals connect to Gen Ed goals 1, 2, and 4.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

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

Comments:

Undergraduate:

The department’s objectives under each learning goal identified generally some tools by which the student’s learning would be measured. Objectives 1.1, 2.3, 2.4, 3.1 indicate that exams and surveys will be used (but as noted above, none of the objectives for goal 3 target lifelong learning, so as a consequence, there appear to be no tools for measuring that implied goal). In addition, the plan did not identify any assessment methods, tools, or standards for measuring achievement regarding objectives 2.1, 2.2, 2.5, 3.1, and 3.2. Thus, while it appears that there may be both direct and indirect tools being used, not all goals are being assessed and it’s unclear what actual measuring is being done.

Graduate:

Assessment methods for learning objective 3.1 were listed using a table format, and included a variety of direct assessment methods, and at least one “multiple measures approach” that merged both instructor evaluation and student self-evaluation. There were no assessment methods indicated for the other four learning goals.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES <u> </u>	NO <u>X</u>	QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </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> </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> </u>
• Were the results tied to goals for student learning?	YES <u> </u>	NO <u> </u>	QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u>

In addition to departmental goals, some assessment results may be applicable to Institutional and General Education goals. A list of the latter goals is included below. Please indicate with a Y, N, or ? whether results reported are applicable to Institutional or General Education goal achievement. For items with a Y or a ?, please describe findings in the appropriate section below.

- 1 Communication (“communicate effectively, both orally and in writing”)
- 2 Critical/creative thinking (“think critically and creatively” and “be intellectually curious and creative”)
- 3 Informed choices (“make informed choices”)
- 4 Understanding across disciplines (“understand how conclusions are reached in the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the arts and sciences” and “acquire knowledge over a broad spectrum of subject areas”)
- 5 Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)
- 6 Cross-cultural appreciation (“develop some familiarity with cultures other than their own”)

_____ 7 Service/citizenship (“commit themselves to...the service of others,” and “share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)

Comments regarding results and the application of results to Departmental, Institutional and General Education Goals:

While the 2006 annual report makes reference to the department assessment plan for both graduate and undergraduate programs, no results were reported, thus at this time there is no relationship indicated between results and any goals.

Undergraduate:

Graduate:

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

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

YES _____ NO X QUALIFIED Y/N _____

- 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:

Graduate:

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.
- X Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
- X 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.
- X 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:

The assessment plan at the undergraduate level is tied, for the most part, to student learning goals. We suggest revisiting objective 1.1 and include the accompanying student learning goal, and reconsider Goal 3 (and its objectives) with an eye towards incorporating more of the broader “*lifelong* commitment to physical health of self and *others*” concern within the program’s mission.

A plan for assessment is in place. However, further definition of the goals and assessment methods would be helpful. For example, there may already be assessment tools used but not indicated in the plan – i.e., direct measures like exams and evaluated course assignments, or indirect measures like student surveys. In addition, there may be rubrics built to score assignments for objectives 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3, in which case those rubrics should be identified in the plan.

In terms of using the assessment process to improve student learning, it appears from the plan that there has yet been no analysis of assessments or even reporting of results. Thus, there is a lack of any indication of implementation efforts and “closing the loop” efforts.

In sum, both plans appear to be incomplete but have the potential to provide the department with good information related to learning goals. We encourage the department to continue to complete plans and move ahead in the assessment cycle.

Reviewers:	Name	<u>Dr. Barbara Combs</u>	<u>Barbara Voglewede</u>
	Department	<u>Education & Human Development</u>	<u>Law</u>
	Phone Number	<u>701-777-2862</u>	<u>701-777-2261</u>
	e-mail	<u>barbara.combs@mail.und.nodak.edu</u>	<u>voglewede@law.und.edu</u>

Section 1: ? Section 2: ? Section 3: N Section 4: N

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