

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2008-09 Annual Reports
GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Anatomy and Cell Biology **DATE** April 9, 2010

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Kirsten Dauphinais and Wayne Swisher

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> |

Comments: Student learning goals are written based on the mission statements for both the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees. All of the student learning goals are measurable and would reflect student's learning in the program.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

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

Comments: The report identifies those student learning goals that were assessed and the methods used to make assessment. However, the process used to collect the data, and the actual data used to make the changes, were not included in the report, only the changes made.

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> |

Comments: The report identifies those changes made in the curriculum, student admission processes, and program requirements as a result of the assessment done, but no actual data were provided.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

- | | | | |
|---|--------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • 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: The changes made in the curriculum directly relate to the student learning goals identified in the Annual Report and the program's Assessment Plan. However, as stated under number 2 and 3 above, no actual data were presented to support the changes made in closing the loop.

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 Anatomy and Cell Biology department has a well designed and articulated assessment plan for its Master's and Ph.D. programs. The student learning goals are clearly stated and reflect the mission statement for each degree program. In this Annual Report, the program discusses those changes made in the curriculum that directly impact student learning outcomes and discusses how the changes will improve student learning as stated in their mission and goals. However, in this particular Annual Report, the department only states that assessment was done and what changes were made as a result, but none of the data used in the assessment was presented. It would be helpful for the department to include more information about the methods used to assess students and the results of the assessments to help interpret the changes made in the department's curriculum, etc.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

- ☒ Annual report
- ___ Appendices (cited in annual report)
- ___ Other (please describe)
- ☒ Assessment plan (as posted)
- ___ Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	___Kirsten ___Dauphinais	___Wayne Swisher___
	Department	Law School	___Graduate School___
	Phone Number	_____	7-2944_____
	e-mail	_____	wayneswisher@mail.und.nodak.edu

Section 1: ___Y___ Section 2: ___Y___ Section 3: ___NA___ 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