

**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**  
**Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2007-08 Annual Reports**

DEPARTMENT Technology DATE 2/27/09

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Fred Remer Barbara Combs

**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> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>U/G</u>  |
| • Do goals address student learning?  | YES <u>    </u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>U/G</u>  |

**Comments:**

**Undergraduate:** A few of the goals as stated in the annual report were abstract. This is particularly true of goals that use passive verbs (understand, develop, etc.) Other goals were very broad (*1. Think critically and creatively*). . . As outlined in the department's undergraduate assessment plan, the objectives at the course level further delineate the more abstract goals and are more discretely assessed at the course level.

**Graduate:** Students' ability to meet goals 2 and 5 are certainly dependent upon student learning, but it is not clear what learning goals would be needed in order to conduct research or produce a body of research. The implication for student learning is there and perhaps course and project rubrics further define student learning. As with the undergraduate goals, the statements tend to be abstract and may be difficult to assess.

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)

    U/G      3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage)

      G      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”)

    U      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:** Of the six goals stated, two related directly to UND Essential Studies goals (1 – Think critically and creatively, and 5 – Define and refine oral, written and visual communication skills) and one related indirectly (4 – Develop an appreciation for ethical and professional practices).

**Graduate:** Of the five goals, two (2/3) related directly to UND/Essential Studies goals and two (1/4) indirectly.

**2. ASSESSMENT METHODS**

Were any specific assessment methods referenced? YES U/G NO      QUALIFIED Y/N     

- If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? YES U/G NO      QUALIFIED Y/N

- Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach? YES U/G NO      QUALIFIED Y/N

**Comments:**

**Undergraduate:** Two specific direct assessment methods were listed. Several indirect methods were noted including a Student Exit Survey. It was unclear how the methods aligned with the goals. The assessment plan provided detail on alignment.

**Graduate:** Three specific direct assessment methods were listed. Several indirect methods were noted including a Graduate Alumni Survey. It was unclear how the newsletter would serve as an indirect assessment. The assessment plan provided detail on alignment.

### 3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES___	NO___	QUALIFIED Y/N ___U/G___
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals?	YES___	NO___G___	QUALIFIED Y/N ___U___
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?	YES___	NO___G___	QUALIFIED Y/N ___U___
• Were the results tied to goals for student learning?	YES___	NO___G___	QUALIFIED Y/N ___U___

**Comments:**

**Undergraduate:** The annual report for FY 2008 concentrated on individual course assessments. Table 7 entitled Inventory of Undergraduate Courses Assessed listed each course and assessment results. All courses that were assessed had average scores better than 70%, with the cumulative average score of all courses approximately 85% as noted in the report. The table also had comments for each course that was assessed. Some comments related to suggested improvements, while others comment on the student's ability to meet the goals. Not every course was assessed, and many of the courses were partially assessed due to lack of faculty supplied materials. Other metrics, as noted in the department's assessment report, were not used this year.

**Graduate:** Initial assessment results began in the fall of 2008; therefore none were reported in the documents reviewed for this report.

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. .

- \_\_\_U\_\_\_ 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:** The results from individual course assessments indicate that more emphasis needs to be placed on communication skills across the curriculum. Comments were also made on the students' ability

**Graduate:** Initial assessment results began in the fall of 2008; therefore none were reported in the documents reviewed for this report.

### 4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment

results reported?

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

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

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

**Comments:**

**Undergraduate:** Most of the suggested changes relate to the assessment process such as committing more time and effort to collecting, analyzing and interpreting data. However, general information relating to faculty changes at the course level were noted (more varied labs, an identification of what needs to be emphasized more in classes, etc.) It was not clear how these changes related directly to student learning.

**Graduate:** Initial assessment results began in the fall of 2008; therefore no closing the loop efforts were reported in the documents reviewed for this report.

**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:**

Consider revising goals to be more focused and specific. Based on the assessment plan, the goals and assessment methods are well aligned, using both direct and indirect methods of assessment. However, few results were given, and limited actions were suggested. Most of the suggestions related to methods to improve the assessment process. It is clear that the Technology Department is knowledgeable about assessment. When process and procedures are fully implemented, important and useful information for improving student learning and programs will result. At present, there seem to be some concerns about full faculty "buy in" and attention to the system.

Reviewer(s):	Name	Fred Remer	Barbara Combs
	Department	Atmospehric Sciences	College of Ed & Human Dev
	Phone Number	777-4055	7-2862
	e-mail	<a href="mailto:rem@aero.und.edu">rem@aero.und.edu</a>	<a href="mailto:barbaracombs@mail.und.edu">barbaracombs@mail.und.edu</a>

Section 1: \_\_Y\_\_ Section 2: \_\_Y\_\_ 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