

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2010 Annual Reports
UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT General Studies DATE April 4, 2011

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

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

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

Comments:

The General Studies Program does not have a common set of courses, but rather involves student in good standing who have not completed a program of study in a specific major; as such, there are no common learning goals for the program.

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) to identify UND/Essential Studies goals which are similar to the referenced departmental goals.

- _____ 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:

No student learning goals were identified.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

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

Comments:

Given that there are no common learning goals, there are no assessment methods identified to assess student learning. Upon request, Tom Rand provided information about assessment in the General Studies Program. Included in his information were suggestions for program assessment methods that could be used to determine whether the Bachelor of General Studies is meeting the purpose for which it was designed.

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 information provided did not include any assessment results.

In addition to departmental goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. Use 'U' (undergraduate) 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:

The information provided did not include any assessment results.

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:

The information provided did not include any “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:

The General Studies Program does not have an assessment plan posted on the Assessment website and neither student learning goals nor assessment methods have been identified. In addition, no assessment information was included in the annual report as information for this report was received from Tom Rand upon request. The department is encouraged to identify student learning goals and assessment methods and to provide information about the program in future annual reports.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

- ☐ Annual report
- ☐ Appendices (cited in annual report)
- ☒ Other (please describe) – Information received from Tom Rand
- ☐ Assessment plan (as posted)
- ☐ Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	Ruth Paur	Cassie Gerhardt
	Department	Pathology	Memorial Union
	Phone Number	7-2651	7-3667
	e-mail	ruth.paur@med.und.edu	cassie.gerhardt@email.und.edu

Section 1: ☐N___ Section 2: ☐N___ 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