

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

DEPARTMENT__Pathology – Certificate in Hematology/Hemostasis__**DATE**__3/24/10__

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW__Fred Remer, Joan Hawthorne__

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|------|-----------------|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES__X__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N__ |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES__X__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N__ |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES__X__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N__ |

Comments:

Goals are well-articulated and clear.

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.

- ____yes__ 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 departmental goals and alignment of departmental goals with institutional and Essential Studies goals:

Only the Communication goal is addressed within expected learning outcomes identified by the department.

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:

Each of the four goals was aligned with specific data sources, including both direct and indirect sources.

We noted that your assessment plan (as posted on UND's website) indicates that assessment information is to be collected from work products in various classes, although the data to be analyzed comes from the national exam – we were confused by this discrepancy. Although we recognize that nationally standardized scores are a very good measure for a program like yours, we hope that the exam results are presented in such a way that you're able to break down student scores by topic and see specific areas where students are excelling and specific areas where performance is weaker.

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

Comments:

National board scores were cited as “excellent” although this report did not include specific scores or national comparisons. However, 100% of UND students passed the national boards. Reference was made to specific results in other areas as well, although example data were not included. E.g., “The categorical coordinator reviewed the performance evaluations and reported that the students had increased their skills significantly....” Including a bit of information to support these conclusions would make the report more readable to those outside of the department, although it’s unnecessary to reproduce all data within the assessment 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. .

- yes 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:

Data regarding communication skills suggested to faculty reviewing that students have “attained competency.”

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:

One example of a change involves adjusting the method of competency testing (for goal #2) given that faculty felt the assessment itself was inappropriate for their purposes. However, plans are also in the works to provide students with more practice on high level questions prior to the assessment itself. Another change cited was the revision of a scoring rubric.

SUMMARY

Strengths

- X A specific plan for assessment is in place.
X Student learning goals are well-articulated.
X Assessment methods are clearly described.
X Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
X Assessment methods are well-implemented.
X Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
X Results are reported.
X Results are tied to closing the loop.

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 tied to evidence.)

(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Excellent example of an assessment report and follow-through on assessment planning. See comments under Methods and Results, above.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

☒ Annual report ☒ Assessment plan (as posted)
☐ Appendices (cited in annual report) ☐ Previous assessment review
☒ Other (please describe) *Assessment report prepared for the SMHS*

Reviewer(s):	Name	<u>Joan Hawthorne</u>	<u>Fred Remer</u>	<u> </u>
	Department	<u>Acad Affairs</u>	<u>Atmosph Sciences</u>	<u> </u>
	Phone Number	<u>7-4684</u>	<u>7-4055</u>	<u> </u>
	e-mail	<u>joan.hawthorne@und.edu</u>	<u>rem@aero.und.edu</u>	<u> </u>

Section 1: Y Section 2: Y 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

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

DEPARTMENT__Pathology – Certificate in Clinical Microbiology__**DATE**__3/24/10__

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW__Fred Remer, Joan Hawthorne__

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|------|-----------------|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES__X__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N__ |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES__X__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N__ |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES__X__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N__ |

Comments:

Goals are well-articulated and clear.

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.

- ___yes_ 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 departmental goals and alignment of departmental goals with institutional and Essential Studies goals:

Only the Communication goal is addressed within expected learning outcomes identified by the department.

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:

Each of the four goals was aligned with specific data sources, including both direct and indirect sources.

We noted that your assessment plan (as posted on UND's website) indicates that assessment information is to be collected from work products in various classes, although the data to be analyzed comes from the national exam – we were confused by this discrepancy. Although we recognize that nationally standardized scores are a very good measure for a program like yours, we hope that the exam results are presented in such a way that you're able to break down student scores by topic and see specific areas where students are excelling and specific areas where performance is weaker.

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

Comments:

National board scores were cited as “excellent” although this report did not include specific scores or national comparisons. However, 100% of UND students passed the national boards. Reference was made to specific results in other areas as well, although example data were not included. E.g., “The categorical coordinator reviewed the performance evaluations and reported that the students had increased their skills significantly....” Including a bit of information to support these conclusions would make the report more readable to those outside of the department, although it’s unnecessary to reproduce all data within the assessment 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. .

- yes 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:

Data regarding communication skills suggested to faculty reviewing that students have “attained competency.”

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:

One example of a change involves adjusting the method of competency testing (for goal #2) given that faculty felt the assessment itself was inappropriate for their purposes. However, plans are also in the works to provide students with more practice on high level questions prior to the assessment itself. Another change cited was the revision of a scoring rubric.

SUMMARY

Strengths

- X A specific plan for assessment is in place.
X Student learning goals are well-articulated.
X Assessment methods are clearly described.
X Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
X Assessment methods are well-implemented.
X Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
X Results are reported.
X Results are tied to closing the loop.

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 tied to evidence.)

(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Excellent example of an assessment report and follow-through on assessment planning. See comments under Methods and Results, above.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

☒ Annual report ☒ Assessment plan (as posted)
☐ Appendices (cited in annual report) ☐ Previous assessment review
☒ Other (please describe) *Assessment report prepared for the SMHS*

Reviewer(s):	Name	<u>Joan Hawthorne</u>	<u>Fred Remer</u>	<u> </u>
	Department	<u>Acad Affairs</u>	<u>Atmosph Sciences</u>	<u> </u>
	Phone Number	<u>7-4684</u>	<u>7-4055</u>	<u> </u>
	e-mail	<u>joan.hawthorne@und.edu</u>	<u>remmer@aero.und.edu</u>	<u> </u>

Section 1: Y Section 2: Y 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

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

DEPARTMENT__Pathology – Certificate in Clinical Immunohematology__**DATE**__3/24/10__

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW__Fred Remer, Joan Hawthorne__

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|------|------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES__X__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N __ |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES__X__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N __ |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES__X__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N __ |

Comments:

Goals are well-articulated and clear.

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.

- ___yes_ 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 departmental goals and alignment of departmental goals with institutional and Essential Studies goals:

Only the Communication goal is addressed within expected learning outcomes identified by the department.

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:

Each of the four goals was aligned with specific data sources, including both direct and indirect sources.

We noted that your assessment plan (as posted on UND's website) indicates that assessment information is to be collected from work products in various classes, although the data to be analyzed comes from the national exam – we were confused by this discrepancy. Although we recognize that nationally standardized scores are a very good measure for a program like yours, we hope that the exam results are presented in such a way that you're able to break down student scores by topic and see specific areas where students are excelling and specific areas where performance is weaker.

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 ____

Comments:

National board scores were cited as “excellent” although this report did not include specific scores or national comparisons. However, 100% of UND students passed the national boards. Reference was made to specific results in other areas as well, although example data were not included. E.g., “The categorical coordinator reviewed the performance evaluations and reported that the students had increased their skills significantly....” Including a bit of information to support these conclusions would make the report more readable to those outside of the department, although it’s unnecessary to reproduce all data within the assessment 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. .

- yes 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:

Data regarding communication skills suggested to faculty reviewing that students have “attained competency.”

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:

One example of a change involves adjusting the method of competency testing (for goal #2) given that faculty felt the assessment itself was inappropriate for their purposes. However, plans are also in the works to provide students with more practice on high level questions prior to the assessment itself. Another change cited was the revision of a scoring rubric.

SUMMARY

Strengths

- X A specific plan for assessment is in place.
X Student learning goals are well-articulated.
X Assessment methods are clearly described.
X Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
X Assessment methods are well-implemented.
X Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
X Results are reported.
X Results are tied to closing the loop.

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 tied to evidence.)

(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Excellent example of an assessment report and follow-through on assessment planning. See comments on methods and data in sections above.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

☒ Annual report ☒ Assessment plan (as posted)
☐ Appendices (cited in annual report) ☐ Previous assessment review
☒ Other (please describe) *Assessment report prepared for the SMHS*

Reviewer(s):	Name	<u>Joan Hawthorne</u>	<u>Fred Remer</u>	<u> </u>
	Department	<u>Acad Affairs</u>	<u>Atmosph Sciences</u>	<u> </u>
	Phone Number	<u>7-4684</u>	<u>7-4055</u>	<u> </u>
	e-mail	<u>joan.hawthorne@und.edu</u>	<u>rem@aero.und.edu</u>	<u> </u>

Section 1: Y Section 2: Y 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

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

DEPARTMENT__Pathology – Categorical Certificate in Chemistry__ **DATE**__3/24/10__

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW__Fred Remer, Joan Hawthorne__

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|------|-----------------|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES__X__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N__ |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES__X__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N__ |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES__X__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N__ |

Comments:

Goals are well-articulated and clear.

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.

- ____yes__ 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 departmental goals and alignment of departmental goals with institutional and Essential Studies goals:

Only the Communication goal is addressed within expected learning outcomes identified by the department.

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:

Each of the four goals was aligned with specific data sources, including both direct and indirect sources.

We noted that your assessment plan (as posted on UND's website) indicates that assessment information is to be collected from work products in various classes, although the data to be analyzed comes from the national exam – we were confused by this discrepancy. Although we recognize that nationally standardized scores are a very good measure for a program like yours, we hope that the exam results are presented in such a way that you're able to break down student scores by topic and see specific areas where students are excelling and specific areas where performance is weaker.

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 ____

Comments:

National board scores were cited as “excellent” although this report did not include specific scores or national comparisons. However, 100% of UND students passed the national boards. Reference was made to specific results in other areas as well, although example data were not included. E.g., “The categorical coordinator reviewed the performance evaluations and reported that the students had increased their skills significantly....” Including a bit of information to support these conclusions would make the report more readable to those outside of the department, although it’s unnecessary to reproduce all data within the assessment 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. .

- __yes__ 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:

Data regarding communication skills suggested to faculty reviewing that students have “attained competency.”

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:

One example of a change is adding study of body fluids to ensure that students improve their knowledge in chemistry and urinalysis. Another change involves adjusting the method of competency testing (for goal #2) given that faculty felt the assessment itself was inappropriate for their purposes. However, plans are also in the works to provide students with more practice on high level questions prior to the assessment itself. Another change cited was the revision of a scoring rubric.

SUMMARY

Strengths

Areas for Improvement

- __X__ A specific plan for assessment is in place.
 __X__ Student learning goals are well-articulated.
 __X__ Assessment methods are clearly described.
 __X__ Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
 __X__ Assessment methods are well-implemented.
 __X__ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
 __X__ Results are reported.

- _____ 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 tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

☐ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Excellent example of an assessment report and follow-through on assessment planning. See comments under Methods and Results, above.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

☒ Annual report

☒ Assessment plan (as posted)

☐ Appendices (cited in annual report)

☐ Previous assessment review

☒ Other (please describe) *Assessment report prepared for the SMHS*

Reviewer(s):	Name	<u>Joan Hawthorne</u>	<u>Fred Remer</u>	<u> </u>
	Department	<u>Acad Affairs</u>	<u>Atmosph Sciences</u>	<u> </u>
	Phone Number	<u>7-4684</u>	<u>7-4055</u>	<u> </u>
	e-mail	<u>joan.hawthorne@und.edu</u>	<u>remmer@aero.und.edu</u>	<u> </u>

Section 1: Y Section 2: Y 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

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

DEPARTMENT__Pathology – Clinical Lab Science_____ **DATE**__3/24/10_____

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW__Fred Remer, Joan Hawthorne_____

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|------|-----------------|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES__X__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N__ |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES__X__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N__ |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES__X__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N__ |

Comments:

Goals are broad and are further broken down into very specific objectives which identify concrete learning outcomes. These are very clear and well-articulated.

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.

- ___Yes_ 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 departmental goals and alignment of departmental goals with institutional and Essential Studies goals:

Only the Communication goal is addressed within expected learning outcomes identified by the department.

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:

Six assessment methods were identified and the department identified which learning goals are addressed through the various methods – alignment was clear and it was easy to make sense of the approach.

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 ☒ NO ☐ QUALIFIED Y/N ☐

Comments:

The pass rate for the national board scores was cited as evidence demonstrating student learning of goal #1. One source of indirect evidence for goal #2 had a very low return rate and was therefore not relevant, but a direct source (evaluation of specific exams related to the goal) showed a disappointing level of achievement. However, upon discussion, faculty concluded that the assessment instrument was problematic and would be revised for the next year. No specific evidence is cited for goal #3, although it appears that a rubric was used to score student work and concrete data could, therefore, be provided. Clinical evaluations were reviewed (a source of direct evidence) for goal #4, and learning was satisfactory.

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. .

- ☐yes ☒ 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:

Review of evaluation written by clinical instructors demonstrated satisfactory achievement of the Communication outcome.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?

YES ☒ NO ☐ 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:

Changes in curriculum (e.g., modality of summer session teaching), teaching practice (e.g., providing students with more experience addressing level III questions), and assessments (e.g., restructuring an assessment) are being made based on the information gleaned from assessment.

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:

If this year's report is typical, faculty in the Clinical Lab Science program are providing an outstanding example of how to do assessment thoughtfully and meaningfully – and yet not create an undue degree of burden or extraneous paperwork. Although the report is short, it is extremely clear and on point.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

☒ Annual report ☒ Assessment plan (as posted)
☐ Appendices (cited in annual report) ☐ Previous assessment review
☒ Other (please describe) *report submitted to the medical school*

Reviewer(s):	Name	<u>Joan Hawthorne</u>	<u>Fred Remer</u>	<u> </u>
	Department	<u>Acad Affairs</u>	<u>Atmosph Sciences</u>	<u> </u>
	Phone Number	<u>7-4684</u>	<u>7-4055</u>	<u> </u>
	e-mail	<u>joan.hawthorne@und.edu</u>	<u>remer@aero.und.edu</u>	<u> </u>

Section 1: Y Section 2: Y 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

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

DEPARTMENT Pathology - Clinical Laboratory Science DATE 3/21/10

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Fred Remer / Joan Hawthorne

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 Department of Pathology Annual Report for the Masters of Science in Clinical Laboratory Science Program (2008-2009) lists four learning goals and two assessment goals. Each learning goal is addressed by specific learning objectives that describe expected student behavior. The learning objectives are student-centered and specifically address cognitive, skill and subject matter dimensions.

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 Department of Pathology Plan for Assessing Student Learning and Departmental Programs (2005-2006) lists assessment methods for each student learning objective. The measures include a mix of direct and indirect measures. The assessment methods are varied and appropriate.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

- | | | | |
|--|---------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| Were any assessment results reported? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </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> X</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> X</u> |
| • Were the results tied to goals for student learning? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> X</u> |

Comments:

Appropriate methods were used to assess each goal, although there was no explicit mention of the results of the final comprehensive exam in assessing Goal 3 or other direct assessments. A summary of the assessment results was included for each goal, but the nature of data and findings were unclear. Strengths and weaknesses were identified in meeting each goal. Indirect assessment methods (such as student feedback) were put to good use, but more detail on the direct assessment results of student learning is desired (including example data or a brief description of analysis, e.g., “using a rubric”).

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 ☒ NO ☐ QUALIFIED Y/N ☐

Comments:

Overall, the assessment results identified strengths and weaknesses. Suggestions were made to address the weaknesses. Specifically, the assessment affirmed the success of on-line seminar in meeting Goal 1. Changes to CLS 591 and 997 were deemed successful in meeting Goal 1. Student feedback in CLS 501 indicated a need for improvement in meeting Goal 2. Both students and faculty agreed that CLS 509 needed to change to meet Goal 3. Suggestions were made to better meet Goal 4. However, all of the changes made seem to stem from indirect assessment findings – and it would be interesting to see if direct assessment indicated any change in student learning. Findings from direct assessment, if available, could add clarity.

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:

It is evident that assessment is an integral part of curriculum improvement. The student learning goals and objectives are well formulated and appropriate. Assessment methods are appropriate and varied. The results of the assessment were used to make changes to the curriculum. While direct assessment methods were included in the assessment plan, it is difficult to tell if they indicate changes in student learning due to the lack of detail in the assessment results. Although indirect assessment is undeniably useful, it can be difficult to tease out the difference between satisfaction and actual learning, and thus our concern about ensuring both indirect and direct assessment data are being collected and used. Overall, a very well organized assessment effort, although it would definitely be helpful to see more detail on findings from (and use of findings from) the direct assessment activities described in your assessment plan. Example data would be extremely helpful to include.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

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

Reviewer(s):	Name	Fred Remer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joan Hawthorne
	Department	Atmospheric Sciences	<input type="checkbox"/> Academic Affairs
	Phone Number	777-4055	<input type="checkbox"/> 777-4684
	e-mail	rem@aero.und.edu	<input type="checkbox"/> joan.hawthorne@und.edu

Section 1: ☒ Y ☐ N Section 2: ☒ Y ☐ N Section 3: ☒ Y ☐ N Section 4: ☒ Y ☐ 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

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

DEPARTMENT___Pathology – Cytotechnology Program_____ **DATE**___3/24/10_____

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW___Fred Remer, Joan Hawthorne_____

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-------|---------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES__X__ | NO___ | QUALIFIED Y/N ___ |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES___ | NO___ | QUALIFIED Y/N __X__ |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES__X__ | NO___ | QUALIFIED Y/N ___ |

Comments:

Goal #1 is worded to include both the learning outcome (“knowledge” in the field) and the assessment (national certification exam). Goals #3 and 4 are clear and well-articulated. Goal #2 is unclear in that it refers to “job entry competency, knowledge, and skills,” without giving any indication of what those might be – although it seems likely that a lot of territory is covered by this broad goal. Normally, we might expect that learning goals would describe the intended learning (knowledge, skills, etc.) to ensure that departmental faculty – and anyone else reviewing the assessment report – is working from a common understanding of what those terms mean.

The Cytotechnology program also has a completely different set of goals identified on a “Cytotechnology Assessment Plan” and posted on UND’s website (pp. 24-25). These goals are much more specific and are broken down into specific learning objectives. Based on the assessment report, this does not appear to be the list of goals (or the assessment plan) being used by the department – although clarity regarding the differences between goals listed in the assessment report and goals listed in the posted assessment plan would be helpful.

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.

- ___Yes_ 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 departmental goals and alignment of departmental goals with institutional and Essential Studies goals:

It appears that Communication is the only ES and institutional goal addressed within the Cytotechnology program. The posted assessment plan (which does not appear to be in use) does not include the communication goal but does include a goal regarding lifelong learning.

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___ | NO___ | QUALIFIED Y/N __X__ |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach? | YES__X__ | NO___ | QUALIFIED Y/N ___ |

Comments:

Although it appears that the certification exam is aligned with the goal about “knowledge” (goal #1) and possibly other goals as well, the extent of that alignment is not clear from the report (i.e., which goals, exactly, are addressed by that exam?). The report also does not explain how other assessment methods (e.g., graduate and employer surveys, assessment results from the clinical site, etc.) align with the four goals identified for the program.

The posted assessment plan indicates that review of student grades is a major assessment strategy, but it is worth noting that final grades rarely align directly with a specific program outcome and, in fact, many factors in addition to achievement of a particular outcome typically influence letter grades. For that reason, we would strongly suggest reviewing elements of students’ graded work (e.g., reviewing questions or assignments which specifically address cytotechnology regulatory measures to see learning around goal #3 from the posted plan) rather than final letter grades.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES <u> X </u>	NO <u> </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> X </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> X </u>
• Were the results tied to goals for student learning?	YES <u> </u>	NO <u> </u>	QUALIFIED Y/N <u> X </u>

Comments:

The pass rate and average scores from the national registry exam are noted, and they clearly align with knowledge goal #1 (the report describes the pass rate as providing information about goals #1, 2, and 3 – although if this is the case, it appears that it would be very difficult to differentiate learning related to the different goals based solely on the information reported). Although UND students had a 100% pass rate, their mean score was below the national average and faculty would like to see that mean score rise.

Entry level skills (goal #2) are evaluated “throughout the program” but details of findings and methods are not provided. Communication skills (and other traits) are evaluated during clinicals, and the report states that program graduates are “able to meet the demands of the cytotechnology profession” – but no specific results are reported and it is difficult to be certain about the kinds of data which might support that conclusion.

Findings from indirect assessments (surveys) were reported in general terms, as were conclusions of an advisory committee.

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:

No results related to these goals were provided.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported? YES NO QUALIFIED Y/N X

- If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning? YES_____ NO X QUALIFIED Y/N _____

Comments:

It appears that faculty will “monitor sensitivity rates” for an additional Pathology course based on their review of assessment findings, but specific actions were not deemed necessary.

5. 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.
- X Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
- X 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.
- X Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The misalignment between the posted plan and the assessment report was confusing to us as reviewers. The posted plan includes well-articulated and clear goals, which differ from goals described in the report. Some methods described in the plan are referred to in the report; perhaps others (e.g., course grades) are no longer in use – but we are uncertain based on the materials reviewed. The nationally standardized exam is undoubtedly a critical and very informative source of information about student learning for program faculty, but the meaning would be clearer if it is possible (which it may be??) to break down elements of the exam in order to align with various intended learning outcomes. It seems that it would be very important, for example, to understand why student scores were below the national average, e.g., are there specific competencies and areas of learning which are much weaker (or stronger) than other areas? Without that more fine-grained information, it would be difficult to make positive changes based on results.

And we reiterate our caution about using end-of-term letter grades as a substitute for assessment results, since grades normally require a similar disaggregation (how much of the grade indicates regulatory knowledge? how much indicates technical competence in lab procedure? how much relates to clarity of communication? etc.) in order to be usable as a source of information about learning.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

- X Annual report
- _____ Appendices (cited in annual report)
- X Other (please describe) *detailed assessment reports submitted to the college*
- X Assessment plan (as posted)
- _____ Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	<u>Joan Hawthorne</u>	<u>Fred Remer</u>	_____
	Department	<u>Acad Affairs</u>	<u>Atmosph Sciences</u>	_____
	Phone Number	<u>7-4684</u>	<u>7-4055</u>	_____
	e-mail	<u>joan.hawthorne@und.edu</u>	<u>remmer@aero.und.edu</u>	_____

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