

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

DEPARTMENT Teaching and Learning **DATE** 2/xx/10

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Darla Adams & 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:

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.

- | | | |
|----------|---|--|
| <u>X</u> | 1 | Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”) |
| <u>X</u> | 2 | Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate) |
| <u>X</u> | 3 | Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage) |
| <u>X</u> | 4 | Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”) |
| <u>X</u> | 5 | Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”) |
| <u>X</u> | 6 | Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”) |
| <u>X</u> | 7 | Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”) |
| <u>X</u> | 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:

Learning goals for undergraduates are identified through 26 program student outcome standards organized around the 10 INTASC (Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium) principles that are used to measure and describe the achievement of teacher candidates. While standards are not directly linked to Institutional and Essential Studies goals they are clearly aligned with all eight of 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>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:

Student learning is measured by the student's completion of “Critical Tasks,” which are essential activities aligned with program standards that are completed, submitted and scored using rubrics. Praxis Exam scores are also collected. Rubrics are used to measure each Critical Task and all data is aggregated.

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: Assessment data was shared and discussed amongst faculty at a T& L Assessment Retreat held in February 2009. Assessment results were difficult for the reviewers to understand, but it appears that the T& L Department faculty understand the findings and their implications. Each of the individual T & L program areas analyzed the aggregated data and determined strengths and weaknesses or gaps and concerns. They then identified an action plan for addressing the noted deficiencies.

In addition to departmental goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. 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:

Institutional and Essential Studies goals are not specifically outlined. These goals, however, appear to be imbedded in the 26 program student outcome standards.

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: Some closing the loop activities were discussed. Curriculum changes to be implemented were identified as a result of the analysis of data during the Assessment Retreat. In addition, discussion is currently ensuing regarding changes to the portfolio to better reflect departmental standards, and a committee has formed to discuss the implementation of a capstone course.

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:

Overall, Teaching and Learning undergraduate programs have an extremely well thought out, and comprehensive assessment plan. Clear progress is noted from the previous assessment review dated 2-21-07.

Some areas of weakness include a lack of an explanation of some of the terminology used in the annual report, and little explanation of what some of the assessment methods used-such as the Praxis tests. Also, there did not appear to be a lot of quantitative evidence reported in the results. Still, it is obvious that the Department of Teaching and Learning understands and values the assessment of student learning.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

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

Reviewer(s):	Name	_____	_____	_____
	Department	_____	_____	_____
	Phone Number	_____	_____	_____
	e-mail	_____	_____	_____

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: TEACHING & LEARNING **DATE** 3/08/10

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

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: Eight student learning goals for the Master's T & L programs are written and aligned with the core propositions of their certifying body.

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> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |

Comments: Methodology at the graduate level seems to be an area that T & L needs to address. A dissertation evaluation form exists for the PhD program and is discussed as the only methodology at that level. Discussion regarding methods for the Master's level occurred among faculty and it was determined that T & L 997 Independent Project and Scholarly Project would be used (with a rubric) to collect and analyze information. An exit interview is also utilized but not described.

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: According to the report, "Informal" results were collected and indicate a number of positive aspects as well as some challenges. Data was collected and reviewed regarding dissertation quality. Master's level results were not described.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

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

- If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning? YES_____ NO___ QUALIFIED Y/N __X__

Comments: Very few methodologies and very few results were indicated, making it difficult to identify closing the loop activities.

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:

Graduate level assessment in T & L has not been as well refined as at the UG level. Student learning goals are clear, but methodology for measuring student learning outcomes and results are minimal. Additionally, because there is a lack of methodology and results, the ability to close the loop is significantly reduced or absent. It is clear from the report that T & L greatly values and understands assessment and we will look to see improvement over time.

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