

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2009-10 Annual Reports
GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT__Geography - Geographic Information System (GIS) Certificate Program **DATE** 3-22-11

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Mary Askim-Lovseth, Shane Gerbert, Wayne Swisher

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: The program's 2004-05 assessment plan provides appropriate student learning goals for this graduate certificate program. These student learning goals are referenced in the 2009-10 Annual Report.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

- | | | | |
|--|--------|---------|---------------------|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced? | YES___ | NO___ | QUALIFIED Y/N __X__ |
| • 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___ | NO__X__ | QUALIFIED Y/N ___ |

Comments: The programs's 2004-05 Assessment Plan provided a detailed method for conducting assessment of student learning. However, these methods were not presented nor discussed in the 2009-10 Annual Report.

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: The 2009-10 Annual Report included the agenda and the minutes from a meeting held in 2009 by the faculty involved with the GIS Certificate Program. The minutes of the meeting indicate that several aspects of the program were discussed regarding program management-program and class enrollments, GPA requirements, delivery format, completion rates, but no direct or indirect data were presented in the Annual Report.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

- | | | | |
|---|----------|---------|-------------------|
| Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported? | YES_____ | NO__X__ | QUALIFIED Y/N ___ |
| • If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning? | YES_____ | NO___ | QUALIFIED Y/N ___ |

Comments: No curriculum or pedagogy changes were noted regarding student learning outcomes. The only change related to grade requirements for those in the Certificate Program ("overall 3.0 or higher average, versus achieving a "B" or higher grade for each class").

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 GIS Certificate Program in Geography has an Assessment Plan and methods on file from 2004-05. However the 2009-10 Annual Report does not include any data that may have been collected from these assessment activities. The Annual Report does include the minutes of a faculty meeting where the agenda consisted of discussing the GIS Certificate Program and possible changes. From this faculty meeting a recommended change was made in program GPA requirements, but this is not related to assessment of student learning outcomes. It is recommended that the Geography faculty involved with the GIS assessment program implement the assessment activities identified in their Assessment Plan, if still appropriate, and begin reporting on the results of this assessment in their 2010-11 Annual Report.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

- ☒ Annual report
- ☐ Appendices (cited in annual report)
- ☐ Other (please describe)
- ☒ Assessment plan (as posted)
- ☒ Previous assessment review (The GIS Certificate Program was not reviewed in 2007)

Reviewer(s):	Name	Mary Askim-Lovseth	Shane Gerbert	Wayne Swisher	___
	Department	_____	_____	_____	
	Phone Number	_____	_____	_____	
	e-mail	_____	_____	_____	

Section 1: ☒ Y ___ Section 2: ☐ NA ___ 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 2009-10 Annual Reports
GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Geography **DATE** March 22, 2011

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Mary Askim-Lovseth, Shane Gerbert, Wayne Swisher

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments: The Geography Department offers two graduate degrees, Master of Arts, and Masters of Science. The Department's Assessment Plan (2004-05) contained well defined student learning goals and objectives and a timeline for completing the assessment including individuals responsible for completing the data gathering and analysis.

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

Comments: The Department's Assessment Plan identified assessment methods appropriate for the goals and objectives identified, including rubrics for assessing student's performance on thesis and independent studies, which were identified as the "primary means of assessment." Though rubrics were developed and apparently used, there was no mention of the rubric criteria. No indirect assessment methods were noted.

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 data were reported in the 2009-10 Annual Report. However the Report stated that "Based on discussions at our 2009-10 end-of-year meeting, and on several such discussions over the past 6 years, we decided that overall our students are not exiting our program with sufficient field experience." It would be beneficial to provide some context regarding why this was perceived as a shortcoming. With no data reported, it is a perception.

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

Comments: The Annual Report indicated a change in the curriculum was made to address the lack of field experience for students. A fields methods course was added as a requirement and the seminar course was dropped (due to the range of topics addressed based on instructor interests). This change was apparently made from assessment results, but there were no assessment data to substantiate it.

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 graduate program in Geography has an Assessment Plan (2004-05) filed with appropriate goals, objectives and methods for conducting the assessment. However, in the program's 2009-10 Annual Report, no assessment data were reported. Also, the program reported that it had collected assessment data but had not analyzed the data at this point, but planned to do so at the end of the 2010-11 academic year. The program did report on some curricular changes that have been recommended, ostensibly from assessment data, but those data were not reported so it is difficult to know if the program has in fact "closed the loop". Since the last assessment review, it appears the graduate program of the Geography Department has stalled regarding follow through with the Assessment Plan. It is recommended that the graduate program in Geography begin to analyze the assessment data that has been collected over the past few years, make appropriate adjustments to the program, if needed, and submit the results of their assessment activities in the 2010-11 Annual Report. It may be good to revisit the 2004-05 Plan to see if the assessment methods are still appropriate and manageable for assessing student learning.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

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

Reviewer(s):	Name	Mary Askim-Lovseth	Shane Gerbert	Wayne Swisher
	Department	_____	_____	_____
	Phone Number	_____	_____	_____
	e-mail	_____	_____	_____

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

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well
- N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA = no information available
- ? = action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2009-10 Annual Reports
UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT _____ *Geography* _____ **DATE** _____ *February 12, 2011* _____

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW _____ *Mary K. Askim-Lovseth, Wayne Swisher, Shane Gerbert* _____

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|----------|------------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO _____ | QUALIFIED Y/N _____ |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES _____ | NO _____ | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES <u>X</u> | NO _____ | QUALIFIED Y/N _____ |

Comments:

Geography's Plan for Assessment of Student Learning is posted online for the BS Program but has not been updated since AY 2004-05. Based on the annual report, the four student learning goals have remained the same. Each goal has respective objectives. Most are written in a measureable format, but some are very subjective in nature and would be difficult to assess. For example, "Students will appreciate...", and "Students will respect and value..."

Too, Student Learning Goal 4 is futuristic and is not able to be assessed within the undergraduate program—"Students will become better citizens over the course of their lives by developing a global, regional, and local perspective on human and environmental issues."

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.

- _____ 1 Communication – written or oral ("able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience")
X _____ 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")
X _____ 6 Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...")
_____ 7 Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelong learning")
X _____ 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:

Four of the eight Institutional and Essential Studies goals are embedded within the BS Geography Program with the verbiage—"analyze and interpret, quantitative analysis, respect and evaluate the diversity of world cultures and their perspectives, and become better citizens" (Departmental Plan for Assessment).

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

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

Comments:

It is noted in the Annual Report that the undergraduate program has not “established program-wide assessments...in a systematic way.” What was noted was a pre-test/post-test for course content and some quantitative reasoning problem sets for two 100 level courses. Regarding the Essential Studies designated courses, faculty “do collect and analyze assessment data” but there was no mention of the specific assessment methods and how they are aligned with individual goals.

No indirect methods were reported. Multiple assessment methods should be explored to provide a broader scope of assessing learning.

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:

“NA” was stated on the Annual Report.

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:

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:

With no assessment results, there were no closing the loop activities. The closest reference to this was the statement regarding assessment data is collected for the Essential Studies courses in order to improve them and revalidate their designation.

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 Geography Department is in the initial stages of assessing student learning within its undergraduate program. The plan is in place but it appears to be overwhelming; for example, one goal has 22 courses where assessment will occur. This is not manageable and may be the impediment for implementation. Other goals and objectives are similar. It is recommended that the Department seek assistance through the Assistant Provost for Assessment of Student Learning, Joan Hawthorne, to develop a more workable plan.

Positive steps the Department is taking include appointing an Assessment Coordinator this academic year (2010-11) and offering a capstone course for the first time this Spring 2011. The capstone course will likely play a major role in the program's assessment.

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	Mary K. Askim-Lovseth	Wayne Swisher
	Department	Marketing	Communication Sciences & Disorders
	Phone Number	777-2930	777-2944
	e-mail	maskim@business.und.edu	wayneswisher@mail.und.edu
	Name	Shane Gerbert	
	Department	Student Rep.	
	Phone Number	777-4377	
	e-mail	shane.gerbert@und.nodak.edu	

Section 1: ☐? ☐ Section 2: ☐? ☐ Section 3: ☐NA ☐ Section 4: ☐NA ☐

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