

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Feedback to Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2006-2007 Annual Reports

DEPARTMENT Interdisciplinary Studies_(IDS) DATE November 2007

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Joan Hawthorne, Jon Jackson

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>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </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.

- 1 Communication ("communicate effectively, both orally and in writing")
- X 2 Critical/creative thinking ("think critically and creatively" and "be intellectually curious and creative")
- 3 Informed choices ("make informed choices")
- X 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 Departmental goals and alignment of Departmental Goals with Institutional and General Education Goals:

Undergraduate: In process of reconsidering goals in response to national trends among similar programs.

Graduate: No grad program.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

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

Comments:

Undergraduate: Methods are referenced and are reasonably well-conceptualized, but it is not clear from the report that all methods are actually being used on a regular cycle to collect information about student learning outcome. Survey data (indirect assessments) are regularly collected, but direct assessment seems to be problematic in terms of data collection and analysis.

Graduate: NA

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported? YES__X__ NO___ QUALIFIED Y/N ___

- If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? YES__X__ NO___ QUALIFIED Y/N ___
- If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? YES__X__ NO___ QUALIFIED Y/N ___
- Were the results tied to goals for student learning? YES__X__ NO___ QUALIFIED Y/N ___

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”)
___Y___ 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:

Undergraduate: Findings regarding the “understanding across disciplines” university/gen ed goal were reported, but in fact what was found was that students did not have an adequate or accurate understanding of “disciplines.”

Graduate: NA

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported? YES__X__ NO___ QUALIFIED Y/N ___

- If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning? YES__X__ NO___ QUALIFIED Y/N ___

Comments:

Undergraduate: Changes were made in core courses to redress the problem that was noted.

Graduate: NA

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:

The plan and promise for assessment of student learning in IDS appears to be in place. Judging from the language in the report, however, it appears that implementation of assessment has been more problematic than had been expected. Furthermore, the program director notes that the program's goals are not well-aligned with goals of other similar programs. It appears that IDS would be very well-served by reworking their assessment plan to reconsider goals and focus in on assessments which will be readily implemented and will provide information relevant to new goals. Further, since some sources of data identified in the current plan have proven problematic, it would be worth rethinking methods in view of what's been learned so far.

Reviewer(s):	Name	<u>Joan Hawthorne</u>	<u>Jon Jackson</u>	<u> </u>
	Department	<u>Provost's Office</u>	<u>Anatomy & Cell Biology</u>	<u> </u>
	Phone Number	<u>777-4684</u>	<u>777-2101</u>	<u> </u>
	e-mail	<u>joan_hawthorne@und.nodak.edu</u>	<u>jackson@medicine.nodak.edu</u>	<u> </u>

Section 1: Y Section 2: ? Section 3: Y 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