

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

DEPARTMENT Recreation & Tourism **DATE** May 3, 2010

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Cassie Gerhardt & Ruth Paur

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 report references 14 learning goals which are derived from professional competencies developed by the National Recreation and Park Association Council on Accreditation.

In addition to the Departmental goals, please also consider UND's Institutional and Essential Studies goals for student learning (shown in alignment within parentheses) and identify which goals are similar to 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)
 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 department's referenced learning goals are program specific and the only alignment with Essentials Studies is in the area of communication; “Demonstrate the ability to utilize the tools of professional communication”.

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 indicates the specific methods developed to assess each of the 14 stated learning goals. For each of the 14 learning goals, various direct and indirect methods are discussed. Further, the report indicates how assessment methods are employed in the various courses in which the 14 learning goals are addressed.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Were the results tied to goals for student learning?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

The report indicates, "The class-by-class approach that was planned two years ago has not been effectively implemented. Some full-time faculty members were found to lack commitment to that process. Also it is very unworkable with part-time faculty, who are increasing being used in the RTS Program". The results that are included are for the 2007 spring, summer, and fall semesters and are based on internship site supervisors' ratings of students on each of the 14 goals. The report also includes data results from intern supervisor evaluations from 2003 – 2006 as well as alumni surveys completed during the summer of 2007 by 2003-2005 graduates.

In addition to departmental goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. Indicate any goals for which the department presents findings, and, for indicated items, describe findings 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:

Assessment of student learning relative to the department's referenced learning goal, "Demonstrate the ability to utilize the tools of professional communication" was 3.17 on a 4 point scale.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

The report indicates "recently proposed curriculum changes are reflective of these assessment results". It is unclear as to what the specific curriculum changes were or what data were used to support the changes.

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 department has well articulated student learning goals and has established a variety of direct and indirect methods by which to assess the achievement of their learning goals. The report includes assessment data, but it is from 2007. It is important that data is collected and reported on an annual basis. Further, the report notes that the assessment methods have not been fully implemented. If fully implemented, the stated methods would provide a variety of data regarding student achievement of the department's learning goals.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

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

Reviewer(s):	Name	<u>Cassie Gerhardt</u>	<u>Ruth Paur</u>
	Department	<u>Memorial Union</u>	<u>Medical Laboratory Science Programs</u>
	Phone Number	<u>777-3667</u>	<u>777-2651</u>
	e-mail	<u>cassiegerhardt@mail.und.edu</u>	<u>ruthpaur@medicine.nodak.edu</u>

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 reported
- ? = action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done