

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

DEPARTMENT Physical Education and Exercise Science DATE May 3, 2010

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Darla Adams and Shane Gerbert

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

*Comments:* Three student learning goals and several sub-objectives are identified. The sub-objectives, however, describe the method or methods of assessment that will be used for each goal. Goal #1 is broad and refers to the students ability to “know and understand the body of knowledge in the core subdisciplines” with a subobjective of “earning a passing score on a comprehensive senior examination of core content”. Goal #3 addresses the student’s demonstration of a commitment to engaging in regular physical activity and a lifelong commitment to physical health. It does not, however, address or reference lifelong commitment to the physical health of others, which would seem to be an important overall mission of the program. Additionally, this goal focuses on the student’s commitment to physical health while enrolled in the program rather than on a lifelong commitment to physical health.

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.

- X     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)  
    X     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:* The assessment plan doesn’t seem to incorporate the larger essential studies goals. There is some implied overlap – for example, between UND essential goal 1 and PEX goals 1 & 2 and between UND goal 4 and PEX goal 2 and 3; The plan does not, however, explicitly indicate a relationship with the goals.

**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>    </u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u>    |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach? | YES <u>    </u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u>    |

*Comments:* Student examinations are listed as the primary method for measuring student learning goal #1 and #2. Additional methods include student activity inventories and training program plans. Emphasis seems to be placed on student examination(s) as the primary assessment method. Actual methods for measuring student learning are only addressed as sub-objectives and it is not clear what actual measuring is being done. For example, a comprehensive examination for senior

students is listed as a subobjective for goals 1 and 2, but a statement following this subobjective indicates that this exam is still under discussion as some faculty believes course-embedded assessments aggregated from the core courses would be a more practical option for assessing the goals.

### 3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

|  |        |         |                   |
|--|--------|---------|-------------------|
| Were any assessment results reported?  | YES___ | NO_X___ | 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:** Notes from a September 2009 Faculty Assessment meeting are provided as part of the assessment report, although the notes do not clearly indicate assessment methods or results. Issues such as low enrollment and improvement in faculty members showing up to class on time were discussed in the minutes from the meeting.

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:**

### 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:** Closing the loop activities are not included.

#### 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.
- \_\_\_X\_\_\_ Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
- \_\_\_X\_\_\_ Assessment methods are not clearly described.
- \_\_\_X\_\_\_ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
- \_\_\_X\_\_\_ Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
- \_\_\_X\_\_\_ A single type of assessment methods predominates.
- \_\_\_X\_\_\_ 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:

*Significant changes or improvements in the implementation of student learning assessment from the February 2005 review is not apparent. Student learning goals and objectives are identified, student examinations prevail as the primary methodology, and results and closing the loop activities are not identified.*

*In terms of goals, we recommend that PEXS revisit goal #3 with the idea of incorporating an emphasis towards lifelong commitment to the physical health of self and others.*

*Additionally, further definition of their methodologies specific to their learning goals would be helpful. For example, if a student paper or assignment is utilized as an assessment method, list it as a method together with the tool used to gather the information (ie. Grading Rubric). If student surveys are used identify which goal they relate to and also report the results of that student survey. Development of a plan for accommodating a person with disabilities is listed as a subobjective ( method) for goal #2, but how or if that data is actually gathered or used is not clear.*

*In terms of using the assessment process to improve student learning, it appears from the plan that there has yet been no analysis of assessment or reporting of results. Thus, there is a lack of any indication of implementation efforts or "closing the loop" efforts.*

*In summary, the undergraduate plan appears to be incomplete but does have the potential to provide the department with good information related to learning goals. We encourage the department to continue to develop their assessment plan, implement their proposed methodologies, report results, and make appropriate curricular or programmatic changes based on this data. We also would like to encourage the department to visit the UND assessment webpage where examples of actual departmental assessment plans may be viewed. Additionally, we would like to encourage the Physical Education and Exercise Science Department to contact any member of the UND Assessment Committee or Joan Hawthorne for additional help and guidance in this process.*

## MATERIALS REVIEWED

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Annual report            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment plan (as posted) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Appendices (cited in annual report) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Previous assessment review  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe)             |   |

|              |              |                                |                              |                             |
|--------------|--------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Reviewer(s): | Name         | <u>Darla Adams</u>             | <u>Shane Gerbert</u>         | <u>                    </u> |
|              | Department   | <u>Nursing</u>                 | <u>Student Rep</u>           | <u>                    </u> |
|              | Phone Number | <u>7-4543</u>                  | <u>                    </u>  | <u>                    </u> |
|              | e-mail       | <u>darlaadams@mail.und.edu</u> | <u>shane.gerbert@und.edu</u> | <u>                    </u> |

Section 1:   ?      Section 2:   ?      Section 3:   N      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 |

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

**DEPARTMENT** Physical Education and Exercise Science **DATE** May 3, 2010

**COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW** Darla Adams and Shane Gerbert

**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:** Four student learning goals were outlined. A 5<sup>th</sup> goal is listed but has yet to be identified other than it will be in the “affective domain” and related to professional and academic conduct. The goals that are complete are nicely written and measurable. This appears to be one area the department is working on.

**2. ASSESSMENT METHODS**

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

**Comments:** Learning goal # 3 includes sub-objectives that include assessment methods for statistical output and analysis. The department mentions in their report that they were in the process of “thinking of assessment methods”, otherwise no other assessment methods identified.

**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:** No results were mentioned.

**4. CLOSING THE LOOP**

- |  |               |              |                         |
|--|---------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?  | YES <u>  </u> | NO <u>X</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 <u>  </u> | NO <u>  </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>  </u> |

**Comments:** Minutes from a faculty assessment meeting included faculty ideas for improving assessment of student learning to include using the student capstone project as a methodology and tracking student progress through the program.

## 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:

*There were repeated instances within the annual report that indicated that the department was thinking about assessment methods, however they did not appear deployed and thus no results or "closing the loop" activities were reported. Cross-checking this report with the feedback dated 2/2/07, there appeared to be very little or no improvement in the areas noted.*

*In summary, the graduate plan appears to be incomplete but does have the potential to provide the department with good information related to learning goals. The student learning goals are well articulated and still being worked on. We encourage the department to continue to develop their assessment plan, implement their proposed methodologies, report results, and make appropriate curricular or programmatic changes based on this data. We also would like to encourage the department to visit the UND assessment webpage where examples of actual departmental assessment plans may be viewed. Additionally, we would like to encourage the Physical Education and Exercise Science Department to contact any member of the UND Assessment Committee or Joan Hawthorne for additional help and guidance in this process.*

## MATERIALS REVIEWED

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

|              |              |                              |                                |  |
|--------------|--------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Reviewer(s): | Name         | <u>Shane Gerbert</u>         | <u>Darla Adams</u>             |  |
|              | Department   | <u>Student Rep</u>           | <u>Nursing</u>                 |  |
|              | Phone Number |                              | <u>7-4543</u>                  |  |
|              | e-mail       | <u>shane.gerbert@und.edu</u> | <u>darlaadams@mail.und.edu</u> |  |

Section 1: \_Y\_    Section 2: \_\_?\_\_    Section 3: \_N\_    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