

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

DEPARTMENT Microbiology and Immunology **DATE** 4-9-10

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: The assessment plans for both the Ph.D. and M.S. program are presented. The Mission Statement and student learning goals are well articulated as are the processes to be followed in assessing the goals, including the use of scoring rubrics to be used by faculty in evaluating the student's progress in attaining the goals. The M.S. assessment plan is new, having been written and implemented in the 2007-08 academic year. The Ph.D. assessment plan was also revised at that time.

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> </u> | NO <u>X</u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments: The annual report describes the new assessment plan that was recently implemented for the M.S. degree program and indicates that the department has begun collecting data "as each student passes through an event for which written evaluations are collected." The department used data from Qualifying Examinations, Diagnostic Examinations, student performance in annual seminars, and written and oral phases of theses and dissertations in assessing student learning. It appears that all of the data to be collected for both the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees will be (is) direct assessment data.

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 annual report indicates that since the revision of the assessment plan in 2007, "few students have undergone examinations for which evaluations can be collected. In addition, these were not all for the same type of evaluation event. As a result, there is insufficient data to begin analysis and decisions for change."

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: No data were presented.

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 Microbiology and Immunology graduate program has an assessment plan for its Master's and Ph.D. programs posted on the Webpage. The Master's program assessment plan was implemented within the past 2 years and some revisions were also made in the Ph.D. assessment plan. The student learning goals are clearly stated as are the Mission Statements for both degree programs. In this annual report, the assessment plan revisions are discussed, but the program states that not enough data have been collected to report.

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	7-6396	7-2944	_____
	e-mail	dauphinais@law.und.edu	wayneswisher@mail.und.nodak.edu	

Section 1: __Y__ Section 2: __?__ Section 3: __NA__ 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