

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2007-08 Annual Reports

DEPARTMENT Geological Engineering DATE March 30, 2009

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Mary Askim-Lovseth, Joan Hawthorne

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

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

Comments:

Undergraduate: Four additional student learning goals were included in the Assessment Plan posted on the University website but not identified in the annual report.

Graduate: A Master of Science degree is offered in Geological Engineering. Student learning goals are well articulated in the Assessment Plan (2004-05 is posted), but are not the same as those listed in the annual report. Some of the learning goals identified in the annual report related to faculty, fields of employment, and performance in coursework.

In addition to the Departmental goals, please also consider UND's Institutional and Essential Studies goals for student learning (shown in alignment within parentheses). Use 'U' (undergraduate) or 'G' (graduate) to identify UND/Essential Studies goals which are similar to the referenced departmental goals.

- U,G 1 Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”)
U,G 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)
G 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage)
U 4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”)
G 5 Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”)
 6 Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”)
U 7 Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)
 8 Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)

Comments regarding departmental goals and alignment of departmental goals with institutional and Essential Studies goals:

Undergraduate: The alignment with University/Essential Studies goals for student learning was done with the posted Assessment Plan (goal statements derived from the rubrics posted on the website). If the annual report was used, communication and lifelong learning would not be noted.

Graduate: Since the posted Assessment Plan is close to five years old, it is difficult to know if those identified in the annual report are revised. The alignment with University/Essential Studies goals for student learning was done with the posted Assessment Plan.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

- | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced? | YES <u>U</u> | NO <u>G</u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u>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>U</u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments:

Undergraduate: Few assessment methods were identified and with only a survey of recent graduates (not apparent that it was graduates of the year under review) reported actually being done. No information was provided regarding the survey questions in order to determine if student learning outcomes were assessed.

Graduate: It was noted that “all theses will be assessed” but there was no indication of how data would be systematically collected during thesis assessment or if such assessment in fact occurred. Furthermore, it’s important to examine the degree to which students achieve learning outcomes (e.g., goals 3, 5, 7, and possibly others) as well as documenting that courses “cover” the specified information.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES____	NO_ <i>U,G</i> __	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:

Undergraduate: Information provided did not relate to student learning goals.

Graduate: No assessment activity was reported.

In addition to departmental goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. Use ‘U’ (undergraduate) or ‘G’ (graduate) to identify those results which are applicable to institutional/Essential Studies goal achievement. For indicated items, please describe findings in the appropriate section below. .

- _____ 1 Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”)
- _____ 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)
- _____ 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage)
- _____ 4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”)
- _____ 5 Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”)
- _____ 6 Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”)
- _____ 7 Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)
- _____ 8 Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)

Comments regarding results and the application of results to departmental, institutional and Essential Studies goals:

Undergraduate:

Graduate:

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?	YES_____	NO_ <i>U,G</i> __	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: It's worth noting (at both the undergraduate and graduate level) that "actions taken" need not be changes in the program. If faculty are collecting data (e.g., analyzing student work products systematically using rubrics or administering knowledge surveys), meeting to share and discuss findings, and concluding that the information does not support any immediate changes in the curriculum, that information can be reported as an "action" taken in response to assessment activities. So if this is occurring, it would be helpful (for on-going attention to learning by faculty within the department, for ABET's use during reaccreditation, and for the HLC's use during institutional accreditation) to document the items that are collected, the analysis and discussion that occur, and the decisions that are made.

Graduate:

SUMMARY

Strengths

Areas for Improvement

 G A specific plan for assessment is in place.
 G 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.)

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

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Based on information included in the annual report, it appears there was little to no assessment done during the 2007-08 academic year for the undergraduate program in Geological Engineering. A "recent" graduate survey was administered, but the report does not indicate whether this was in 2007-08 or prior to that time. In any case, some assessment activity should occur for each program on an annual basis, which is far more manageable (and more useful) than trying to do it all at once, potentially in the year before a program review or accreditation visit. Because numbers in the program are small, it would be easier to document all results of the assessment measures noted in the Assessment Plan (e.g., course examinations, laboratory reports, and student portfolios).

For the graduate program, there is a huge disparity between the posted Assessment Plan and what is referenced in the annual report. If the Assessment Plan is current, it should be followed as it is well done.

Reviewer(s):	Name	Mary Askim-Lovseth	Joan Hawthorne
	Department	Marketing	Academic Affairs
	Phone Number	777-2930	777-4684
	e-mail	mary.askim@mail.business.und.edu	joan_hawthorne@und.nodak.edu

Section 1: ?(U), Y(G) Section 2: N(U,G) Section 3: N(U,G) Section 4: N(U,G)

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