Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in __2009-10 Annual Reports <u>UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS</u>

DEPAK	TMENT_Languages—French		DATE_	_February 18, 2011
COMM	ITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REV	IEWJoan I	Hawthorne	e, Krista Lynn Minnotte
1. STUI	DENT LEARNING GOALS			
	Were any goals referenced?If so, were goals well articulated?Do goals address student learning?	YES_X_ YES YES_X_	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N _X QUALIFIED Y/N
a very ge whether t appear to target lan literature on what i language of the van	earns in the department use the same three general legeral leg	anguage cultur d plan), goals a "critically rea rs are quite bro at students (and wledge." It mi by the broad d	e(s)." In at tre broken d d and interp pad: "Know faculty) wii ght be worth epartmentai	least some of these programs (and lown into objectives. Those objectives oret a variety of literary texts in the with the history of the target language thin a program could easily disagree a considering whether individual ligoals or objectives within the context
The Fren	ch goal of focus for 2009-10 was knowledge of liter	atures, and thre	e objectives	s were identified.
(shown ii which arex	on to the Departmental goals, please also consider Unalignment within parentheses). Use 'U' (undergrade similar to the referenced departmental goals. 1 Communication – written or oral ("able to write 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be 4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning 5 Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluated Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of diverson Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelong 8 Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both for the regarding departmental goals and alignment of the regarding departmental goals and alignment of the similar parameters of the regarding departmental goals and alignment of the regarding departmental goals are goals.	and speak in variate intellectually of intellectually ("apply empiricatefor effectivity and use that g learning")	arious settin curious"; an creative"; e al dataan ive, efficien a understand	identify UND/Essential Studies goals gs with a sense of purpose/audience") alyze, synthesize, evaluate) explore, discover, engage) alyze graphical information") t, and ethical use") ing") the world")
"demons understa	quages goals clearly address communication and matrate[ing] knowledge of target language culture" reduing of diversity and [being able to]use that unders ure and target language culture(s)," for the prograngoal.	ally addresses to	the same out objective "c	tcome as "demonstrate[ing] critically analyze differences between
2. ASSE	SSMENT METHODS			
Were any	 specific assessment methods referenced? If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? Were both direct and indirect assessment 			QUALIFIED Y/N

methods used as components of a "multiple	YES	NO_x_	QUALIFIED Y/N
measures" approach?			

Comments:

The general assessment plan does not specify any methods, but specific courses are identified (within each program) for assessment of the intended learning outcomes. The aim is for designated teachers of the various courses to make their own decisions about appropriate methods, as well as to collect, analyze, interpret, and document data relevant to that course. It does not appear that plans were made for program-wide (or department-wide) discussion of findings and decision-making based on findings.

Each program's report, however, does include a description of data collection methods used during 2009-10. For French, data were collected in the form of student scores on take-home exams which required them to analyze, contrast, and compare French literary works. The plan specifies four classes from which data would be collected for the literature goal, but it appears that the actual assessment focused on test scores from a single class. Three changes might make future assessments more useful:

- Structure test questions or grading processes in such a way that they will produce information that relates specifically to an individual outcome. In this case, e.g., it appears that it would be difficult to tell language proficiency or critical thinking ability from literary knowledge (the goal of interest).
- If at all possible, collect work samples from across three or four of the target classes (perhaps during different semesters) and plan an assessment discussion that might even include a bit of time for rereading some of the student work samples (perhaps from classes other than one's own). Analyzing across multiple courses will make findings feel relevant to the program rather than primarily to an individual teacher and course.
- Consider supplementing direct assessments with indirect assessments. Just doing an every-other-year survey in a
 key senior course could tell you if about-to-be graduates believe they have achieved each of the goals and
 objectives selected for the program, thus rounding out the assessment picture.

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	NO_x_	QUALIFIED Y/N
 If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? 	YES	NO_x_	QUALIFIED Y/N
 Were the results tied to goals for student learning? 	YES	NO_x_	QUALIFIED Y/N

Comments:

The tests used for data collection were presumably chosen because test content was closely related to the goal of interest – but it should be possible to use a similar procedure for data collection that allows scores to be disaggregated by specific objectives or grading criteria (e.g., students may receive some credit for effort, some credit for correctness, some credit for novel ideas, etc. – all of which are of value and could conceivably count toward the grade, but not all of which demonstrate knowledge of the relevant body of literature).

No analysis, interpretation, or discussion was included to indicate what conclusions, if any, could be drawn.

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 dataanalyze graphical information")
5 Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluatefor 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 department	tal, institution	al and Essential Studies goals:	
The goal of focus this year did not align with ES.				
4. CLOSING THE LOOP				
Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported? • If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?			QUALIFIED Y/N	
Comments:				
No departmental or program-wide actions were discussed a findings. However, faculty in the department are engaged to reconsideration of their assessment strategies. It sounds like the curriculum generally (i.e., creating a new interdisciplinal leadership of coordinators).	his year (2010 e this may be o	-11), accordir one componen	ng to the 2009-10 annual report, in tof what sounds like a re-energizin	ng of
SUMMARY Strengths		Areas j	for Improvement	
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.)	 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. x_ Assessment methods are not well-implemented. x_ A single type of assessment methods predominates. 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 RECOMMENDATI It appears that the department is poised to move in a product commitment to rethink and improve assessment, potentially years. Incorporating assessment activities could – and show data will help faculty distinguish between anecdotal and improve assessment activities could – and show data will help faculty distinguish between anecdotal and improve assessment out by systematically-conducted sections offered during two different years showed"). Now will be possible to avoid spending energy on issues which the little easy to focus on goals and methods when planning assessuccessful at using the data they have already collected. The relevant – but it also may be simply a lack of planning for context to the case, we would strongly encourage building in processed data, assessment feels like busywork. Once assessment gets the aim of an improved plan and process. Please note suggestions under "Methods" – and don't hesitation.	ctive direction paving the way ald — occur as a pressionistic "plected data (in lot only will the property out to be lessent, but it it is may be beconstituted analy as that will ensure used, it begin,	y for addition, a key compon findings" (i.e., "a review se case for chars important, appears that tause the data exis, discussion are such collect to be an inte	al improvements over the next seve ent of the changes. Reviewing actual, "I've noted that my students usual of student work samples collected inge (when needed) be clearer, but less common, or less substantive. The Languages Department has not are not seen as programmatically in, and decision-making. If the lattective activities occur. Without use gral part of good teaching — which	ual glly from it been er is of
Consultants (see the Assessment site on the web) for more co				ver t

___X__ Assessment plan (as posted)

MATERIALS REVIEWED

___X__ Annual report

Appendic	ces (cited in annual report)		_ Previous assessment review	
X Other (please describe)			
Previous annua	l report.			
Reviewer(s):	Name Department Phone Number e-mail	Joan Hawthorne Academic Affairs 7-4684	<i>2</i> ;	und adu
		Journa willorne Comain		
Section 1:Y_	Section 2:?	Section 3:? Sect	ion 4:N	
Coding Key:				
Y =	yes, this is done appropri	ately and well		
	no, this is not done at all,		onship to student learning	
NA =	no information available			
? =	action or progress is appa	arent; however, evidence	is lacking that this is complete	ly and appropriately done

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in __2009-10 Annual Reports <u>UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS</u>

DEPART	MENT_Languages—Norwegian		DATE_	_February 18, 2011
COMMIT	TEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REV	IEW_Joan	Hawthorne	, Krista Lynn Minnotte
1. STUDE	NT LEARNING GOALS			
•	Were any goals referenced? If so, were goals well articulated? Do goals address student learning?	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N _X_ QUALIFIED Y/N
a very gener whether this appear to be target langu literature(s) on what it m language pr	as in the department use the same three general le ral level (i.e., "demonstrate knowledge of target les applies to them all is unclear from the report an e more specific and more readily assessable (e.g., uage"). Even within the objectives, however, othe leans to "know the history" or "demonstrate know to "know the history" or "demonstrate know to grams could more clearly specify what is meant us programs. At the least, it might be helpful if the	anguage cultured plan), goals of the control of the	re(s)." In at a care broken do and interpo oad: "Know I faculty) with ght be worth lepartmental	least some of these programs (and own into objectives. Those objectives ret a variety of literary texts in the the history of the target language hin a program could easily disagree considering whether individual goals or objectives within the context
directly alig course-spec problems id how well ou	of Norwegian specifically, the learning outcomes in with the learning goals and objectives identifie ific goals and objectives (for ES purposes, for col- lentified at the program level), but the primary ain ir students achieve the program outcomes we wor rong focus on learning that's demonstrated near t	d by the depart urse-specific po m of assessmen k toward with	tment. It is warposes, and just of learning them. So asset	orth identifying and working with potentially to explore the basis for any at the program level is to understand essment activities should definitely
(shown in al which are si which are si	to the Departmental goals, please also consider U lignment within parentheses). Use 'U' (undergradimilar to the referenced departmental goals. Communication – written or oral ("able to write Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluation of the Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of diverse Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelon Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both for	and speak in ve intellectually be intellectually ("apply empiricatefor effectsity and use that g learning")	graduate) to invarious setting curious"; and recentive"; excal dataand tive, efficient tunderstandi	dentify UND/Essential Studies goals gs with a sense of purpose/audience") alyze, synthesize, evaluate) xplore, discover, engage) alyze graphical information") , and ethical use") ng")

Comments regarding departmental goals and alignment of departmental goals with institutional and Essential Studies goals:

The Languages goals clearly address communication and may address diversity – although it's difficult to be certain if "demonstrate[ing] knowledge of target language culture" really addresses the same outcome as "demonstrate[ing] understanding of diversity and [being able to]use that understanding." The objective "critically analyze differences between U.S. culture and target language culture(s)," for the programs where applicable, does seem to definitely address the ES diversity goal.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

Were any specific assessment methods referenced? • If so, were specifically chosen assessment	YES_X	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N				
methods appropriately aligned with individual goals?	YES_X_	_ NO	QUALIFIED Y/N				
 Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach? 	YES	NO_x_	QUALIFIED Y/N				
Comments:							
The general assessment plan does not specify any methods, be assessment of the intended learning outcomes. The aim is for decisions about appropriate methods, as well as to collect, and does not appear that plans were made for program-wide (or a based on findings.	r designated te nalyze, interpi	eachers of the et, and docu	e various courses to make their own ment data relevant to that course. It				
Each program's report, however, does include a description Norwegian, learning related to oral communication was exar Scores on that examination were divided into points for communich were identified as important components of effective or conducted over two years, were examined, although the focus goals. It would be good to also include indirect assessment, student work products.	mined and the nunicative abi ral communic s of assessmen	tool used wa lity, gramma ation. Scores at may not be	s scores from an oral examination. tical accuracy, and vocabulary, all of s from three sections of the course, directly aligned with the program-level				
3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS							
Were any assessment results reported? • If so, were the results clear in terms of how	YES_X_	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N				
they specifically affirm achievement of goals? • If so, were the results clear in terms of how	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/NX				
they indicate need for improvement?	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N _X_				
 Were the results tied to goals for student learning? 	YES_X_	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N				
Comments: The selected assessment strategy included a couple of elements of good assessment practice, i.e.,(1) use of a scoring rubric which allowed the overall oral exam score to be disaggregated into its component parts (allowing faculty to see how various criteria influenced the score and which were areas of greater strength or weakness) and (2) use of scores collected across multiple sections. The findings could be very useful in understanding how students' development of skills progresses through the program. However, collection of data from a 100 level course says little about how those students are doing by the time they complete the program. Occasional analysis of data from a lower division course may be useful within a broader program assessment effort, but information from senior level courses (as specified in the departmental assessment plan) would be more helpful in analyzing learning at the program level.							
We note that there was an effort to analyze and interpret score confusing. For example, a move from 85% - 90% accuracy (the same, while substantive change was described for a move higher. More explanation of analysis and conclusions might	across years) from 88% to	on one criter	ion was interpreted as almost exactly				
In addition to departmental goals, some assessment results me 'U' (undergraduate) or 'G' (graduate) to identify those results achievement. For indicated items, please describe findings inX1 Communication – written or oral ("able to write2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning 65 Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluations)	s which are ap in the appropria e and speak in e intellectually be intellectuall ("apply empir	plicable to in the section be various setting curious"; an y creative"; of ical dataan	astitutional/Essential Studies goal clow ngs with a sense of purpose/audience") alyze, synthesize, evaluate) explore, discover, engage) alyze graphical information")				

6 Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of divers 7 Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelon 8 Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both for	ng learning")
Comments regarding results and the application of results	to departmental, institutional and Essential Studies goals:
Oral communication was examined and students generally a interest.	lemonstrated achievement in the 85-95% range on the criteria of
4. CLOSING THE LOOP	
Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported? • If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	YES NOX_ QUALIFIED Y/N YES NO QUALIFIED Y/N
Comments:	
findings. However, faculty in the department are engaged the reconsideration of their assessment strategies. It sounds like	s having occurred during the last year as a result of assessment his year (2010-11), according to the 2009-10 annual report, in e this may be one component of what sounds like a re-energizing o ary capstone, organizing lower division language courses under th
SUMMARY	
Strengths	Areas for Improvement
A specific plan for assessment is in placeStudent learning goals are well-articulatedAssessment methods are clearly describedAssessment methods are appropriately selectedAssessment methods are well-implementedDirect and indirect methods are implementedXResults are reportedResults are tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is tied to evidence.)	No specific plan for assessment is in placeStudent learning goals are not well-articulatedAssessment methods are not clearly describedAssessment methods are not appropriately selectedAssessment methods are not well-implementedXA single type of assessment methods predominatesNo results are reportedXResults are not clearly tied to closing the loop(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)
OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATI	ONS:

It appears that the department is poised to move in a productive direction with changes that have already occurred and a commitment to rethink and improve assessment, potentially paving the way for additional improvements over the next several years. Incorporating assessment activities could – and should – occur as a key component of the changes. Reviewing actual data will help faculty distinguish between anecdotal and impressionistic "findings" (i.e., "I've noted that my students usually can't....") and those that are borne out by systematically-collected data (i.e., "a review of student work samples collected from 4 sections offered during two different years showed..."). Not only will the case for change (when needed) be clearer, but it will be possible to avoid spending energy on issues which turn out to be less important, less common, or less substantive.

It is easy to focus on goals and methods when planning assessment, but it appears that the Languages Department has not been successful at using the data they have already collected. This may be because the data are not seen as programmatically relevant – but it also may be simply a lack of planning for collective analysis, discussion, and decision-making. If the latter is the case, we would strongly encourage building in processes that will ensure such collective activities occur. Without use of data, assessment feels like busywork. Once assessment gets used, it begins to be an integral part of good teaching – which is the aim of an improved plan and process.

For Norwegian specifically, we would recommend that assessment focus on demonstration of relevant learning at the program-completion stage. We would also recommend including indirect assessment – a very easy way to double-check data regarding student learning by checking against students' own impressions of the learning on the goals in question. As always, either of us as reviewers or individuals serving as Assessment Consultants (see list on UND's assessment website)would be happy to consult during the process of reviewing and revising current plans for assessment.

MA	TER	AT.	SRE	CVIE	WED

	dices (cited in annual report) r (please describe)	X Assessment plan (as posted) Previous assessment review			
Reviewer(s):	Name Department Phone Number e-mail			ınd.edu	
Section 1:	_Y Section 2:?	Section 3:? Se	ection 4:N		
Coding Key: Y N NA ?	 yes, this is done appropria no, this is not done at all, no information available action or progress is appa 	or it is not done in rela	ntionship to student learning the is lacking that this is completely	y and appropriately done	

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in __2009-10 Annual Reports **UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

DEPARTMENT_Languages - German		DATE	EFebruary 18, 2011
COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING RI	EVIEWJoan	Hawthorn	e, Krista Lynn Minnotte
1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS			
Were any goals referenced?If so, were goals well articulated?Do goals address student learning?	YES_X_ YES YES_X_	NO NO NO	QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N _X QUALIFIED Y/N
Comments: All programs in the department use the same three genera a very general level (i.e., "demonstrate knowledge of targ whether this applies to them all is unclear from the report appear to be more specific and more readily assessable (a target language"). Even within the objectives, however, diterature(s)." From an outsider's perspective, it appears on what it means to "know the history" or "demonstrate language programs could more clearly specify what is most the various programs. At the least, it might be helpful is the various programs. In the case of the German program specifically, the goal of culture were examined, but those aspects do not align a plan — leading reviewers to question whether the German department may already be altering assessment strategies originally devised goals and objectives. In addition to the Departmental goals, please also consider	get language cultit and plan), goals e.g., "critically reothers are quite be that students (arknowledge." It meant by the broad if the plan indicate chosen for assess directly with the caprogram has a desto conform more	are(s)." In a are broken of and intergroad: "Known of faculty) with the worth departments are which object that this year that the content of the content of the nearly with are been are with the content of the nearly with are been are been are with the content of the nearly with are been ar	t least some of these programs (and down into objectives. Those objectives pret a variety of literary texts in the w the history of the target language ithin a program could easily disagree h considering whether individual all goals or objectives within the context ectives have been selected by each of ar was the culture goal. Several aspects tives cited in the Languages assessment objectives or whether programs in the what's actually taught rather than the
(shown in alignment within parentheses). Use 'U' (under which are similar to the referenced departmental goals.	rgraduate) or 'G' vrite and speak in 'be intellectually or 'be intellectually ing ("apply empir valuatefor effect versity and use the elong learning")	(graduate) to various setting various"; and ly creative"; ical dataar ctive, efficient at understand	identify UND/Essential Studies goals ngs with a sense of purpose/audience") nalyze, synthesize, evaluate) explore, discover, engage) nalyze graphical information") nt, and ethical use") ding")
Comments regarding departmental goals and alignment goals:	t of departmental	goals with in	nstitutional and Essential Studies

The Languages goals clearly address communication and may address diversity – although it's difficult to be certain if "demonstrate[ing] knowledge of target language culture" really addresses the same outcome as "demonstrate[ing] understanding of diversity and [being able to]use that understanding." The objective "critically analyze differences between U.S. culture and target language culture(s)," for the programs where applicable, does seem to definitely address the ES diversity goal.

Aspects of the cultures goal assessed this year do seem to align with the diversity goal, e.g., seeing the U.S. through the eyes of Germans and vice versa.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

Were any specific assessment methods referenced?
If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals?
Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach?
YES_X____ NO____ QUALIFIED Y/N _____
QUALIFIED Y/N _____
YES______ NO____ QUALIFIED Y/N _____

Comments:

The general assessment plan does not specify any methods, but specific courses are identified (within each program) for assessment of the intended learning outcomes. The aim is for designated teachers of the various courses to make their own decisions about appropriate methods, as well as to collect, analyze, interpret, and document data relevant to that course. It does not appear that plans were made for program-wide (or department-wide) discussion of findings and decision-making based on findings.

Each program's report, however, does include a description of data collection methods used during 2009-10. The German program submitted data collected from a single section (7 students) of a single German class, and it was not one of the classes designated for collection of cultures data in the assessment plan. However, the questions used on the assessment seem to very clearly align with the cultures aspect of language study so perhaps the curriculum or the plan has changed since the posted plan was developed.

It would be helpful to include indirect assessment as well, which can serve to confirm or disconfirm findings from other approaches.

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 NO	QUALIFIED Y/N _X
 If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? Were the results tied to goals for student 	YES NO	QUALIFIED Y/NX_
learning?	YES_X_ NO	QUALIFIED Y/N

Comments:

It was very helpful to see the report writer's analysis of the test items and scores, each of which was connected back to some aspect of the diversity goal. Results were compared to results from previous years, and learning demonstrated on multiple choice portions of the test (presumably demonstrating recognition more than ability to apply) was compared to learning demonstrated on essay portions. The report writer notes that most students are able to demonstrate knowledge of "facts and informational bits and pieces" but the evidence of being able to generate "well-organized and clearly delineated" essay answers (presumably a demonstration of a deeper level of learning) was less satisfactory. This type of analysis is exactly what we'd like to see applied more directly to the goals identified as program outcomes.

8 Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both fo	or their commu	nities and for	the world")
Comments regarding results and the application of results at Evidence demonstrates learning around the diversity goal, a learning related to cultures.			
4. CLOSING THE LOOP			
Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported? • If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	YES		QUALIFIED Y/N
Comments:			
No departmental or program-wide actions were discussed as findings. However, faculty in the department are engaged the reconsideration of their assessment strategies. It sounds like the curriculum generally (i.e., creating a new interdisciplinal leadership of coordinators). However, the report writer for German does offer two concrefashion, would constitute loop-closing: Students need to do more reading and writing a more program-wide conversation about where curriculum; Students' achievement in this area is consideral months within a German-speaking country, pre	nis year (2010-ee this may be of ary capstone, of the suggestions around the tope and how these ably greater if the suggestion of the sugg	11), according the component of the component of the component of the control of	g to the 2009-10 annual report, in t of what sounds like a re-energizing of yer division language courses under the ecussed and implemented in some a culture, possibly indicating a need for corporated into the German as had an opportunity to spend several
study abroad experiences.			
SUMMARY Strengths		Areas j	for Improvement
A specific plan for assessment is in place Student learning goals are well-articulated X Assessment methods are clearly described Assessment methods are appropriately selected Assessment methods are well-implemented Direct and indirect methods are implemented X_Results are reported Results are tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is tied to evidence.)	Studer Assess Assess X A sin No res Result	nt learning go sment method sment method sment method ngle type of a sults are reports are not clear	r assessment is in place. als are not well-articulated. Is are not clearly described. Is are not appropriately selected. Is are not well-implemented. Is sessment methods predominates. Ited. Ited. Ited to closing the loop. Is not directly tied to evidence.

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

It appears that the department is poised to move in a productive direction with changes that have already occurred and a commitment to rethink and improve assessment, potentially paving the way for additional improvements over the next several years. Incorporating assessment activities could – and should – occur as a key component of the changes. Reviewing actual data will help faculty distinguish between anecdotal and impressionistic "findings" (i.e., "I've noted that my students usually can't…") and those that are borne out by systematically-collected data (i.e., "a review of student work samples collected from 4 sections offered during two different years showed…"). Not only will the case for change (when needed) be clearer, but it will be possible to avoid spending energy on issues which turn out to be less important, less common, or less substantive.

It is easy to focus on goals and methods when planning assessment, but it appears that the Languages Department has not been successful at using the data they have already collected. This may be because the data are not seen as programmatically relevant – but it also may be simply a lack of planning for collective analysis, discussion, and decision-making. If the latter is

the case, we would strongly encourage building in processes that will ensure such collective activities occur. Without use of data, assessment feels like busywork. Once assessment gets used, it begins to be an integral part of good teaching – which is the aim of an improved plan and process.

Regarding the German program specifically, the program faculty are to be commended for including some thoughtful analysis of the data in relation to the relevant goal. However, concerns remain:

- The reason why data regarding the culture goal were collected from a course not among those designated in the assessment plan is unclear indicating a need to revisit that plan and possibly revise.
- Any time data are collected from a single course taught by a single teacher, it is worth considering whether there would be ways of collecting information that faculty would see as more representative of student learning at the time of program completion rather than representing learning in one course at one point in time —which may make the data feel less useful to faculty across the board.
- Indirect data could be collected by surveying students about their perceptions of learning related to program goals a simple process but useful information.
- Finally, any time good information is collected, a critical step is to build in opportunities for cross-program discussion and decision-making. That would be a great next step for this and similar data which have already been collected.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

	ces (cited in annual report) (please describe)		X Assessment plan (as poste _ Previous assessment review	
Reviewer(s):	Name Department Phone Number e-mail		Krista Lynn Minnotte Sociology _7-4419 l.und.edu krista.minnotte@	 @und.edu
Section 1:Y	Section 2:? S	Section 3:? Sec	etion 4:N	
N = NA =	 yes, this is done appropria no, this is not done at all, no information available action or progress is appa 	or it is not done in relati	ionship to student learning is lacking that this is complet	ely and appropriately done

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in __2009-10 Annual Reports <u>UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS</u>

DEPARTMENT_Languages – Chinese	DATEFebruary 18, 2011
COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING I	REVIEWJoan Hawthorne, Krista Lynn Minnotte
1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS	
Were any goals referenced?If so, were goals well articulated?Do goals address student learning?	YES_X_ NO QUALIFIED Y/N YES NO QUALIFIED Y/N _X YES_X_ NO QUALIFIED Y/N
a very general level (i.e., "demonstrate knowledge of ta whether this applies to them all is unclear from the repo appear to be more specific and more readily assessable target language"). Even within the objectives, however literature(s)." From an outsider's perspective, it appea on what it means to "know the history" or "demonstrat language programs could more clearly specify what is n	eral learning goals which are clearly focused on learning but written a greet language culture(s)." In at least some of these programs (and ort and plan), goals are broken down into objectives. Those objectives (e.g., "critically read and interpret a variety of literary texts in the r, others are quite broad: "Know the history of the target language ars that students (and faculty) within a program could easily disagree the knowledge." It might be worth considering whether individual meant by the broad departmental goals or objectives within the contex lift the plan indicated which objectives have been selected by each of
as a result. The Chinese program report identifies two	and the goals described in the Languages plan appear to be scaled bac goals: proficiency in passive skills of listening and reading king and writing. These appear to correspond to the first goal generally.
(shown in alignment within parentheses). Use 'U' (und which are similar to the referenced departmental goals.	diversity and use that understanding") ifelong learning")

Comments regarding departmental goals and alignment of departmental goals with institutional and Essential Studies goals:

The Languages goals clearly address communication and may address diversity – although it's difficult to be certain if "demonstrate[ing] knowledge of target language culture" really addresses the same outcome as "demonstrate[ing] understanding of diversity and [being able to]use that understanding." The objective "critically analyze differences between U.S. culture and target language culture(s)," for the programs where applicable, does seem to definitely address the ES diversity goal.

For the Chinese program, the primary alignment with ES appears to be regarding the Communication goal.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

Were any specific assessment methods referenced?
If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals?
Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach?
YES_X____ NO____ QUALIFIED Y/N _____
QUALIFIED Y/N _____
QUALIFIED Y/N _____

Comments:

The general assessment plan does not specify any methods, but specific courses are identified (within each program) for assessment of the intended learning outcomes. The aim is for designated teachers of the various courses to make their own decisions about appropriate methods, as well as to collect, analyze, interpret, and document data relevant to that course. It does not appear that plans were made for program-wide (or department-wide) discussion of findings and decision-making based on findings.

Each program's report, however, does include a description of data collection methods used during 2009-10. For the Chinese program, several different kinds of information were collected in the second year courses. Students take written quizzes to address understanding of Chinese grammar, participate in oral exams and interviews to address communication proficiency and grammatical adeptness, and engage in small group activities which include speaking and writing assessments. Assessments (tests, prompts, etc.) are pasted into the report.

It appears that one question on an exam also addresses student perceptions of their own learning since students are asked to describe aspects of the course which promote learning. If we saw clearer evidence that you are collecting and analyzing indirect evidence of learning in relation to program goals, we would have said Yes to the question about both direct and indirect methods.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?
If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals?
If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?
Were the results tied to goals for student learning?
YES_X_NO___QUALIFIED Y/N _X_

Comments:

Student scores on a variety of tests and work products are included in the report. Some scores are disaggregated by criteria (e.g., grammar, delivery, comprehensibility, originality) and others are not. Most of these items relate to the general goals of passive and active communication (reading, writing, speaking, listening) but they are not directly aligned. For example, is grammar seen as part of reading or speaking? Or all four? Some may not directly relate to any of the goals (e.g., originality). Scores from other assessments (e.g., the written exam) are included but are not broken down at all, leaving it difficult to determine how the various items are intended to align with the course and program goals.

Providing enough detail for readers to understand exactly the meaning of every assessment is not the primary aim of assessment, but examining the data in that way can be exceptionally useful for program faculty themselves. Seeing which goals are best achieved and which aspects of goals are least satisfactorily achieved can help faculty make decisions about any curricular or programmatic changes which might result from assessment, and it is often difficult to see patterns until the alignment between goals, item scores, and overall results is clearly laid out.

Finally, it would be interesting to read the report writer's analysis and interpretation of scores submitted within the report. What do these numbers mean? Which areas are seen as weakest or strongest? What needs may be revealed? What next?

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.

2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be—————3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be————————————————————————————————————	("apply empirical dataanalyze graphical information") uatefor effective, efficient, and ethical use") ity and use that understanding") ing learning")
Comments regarding results and the application of results to	to departmental, institutional and Essential Studies goals:
Results are clearly applicable to the ES goal of communicational communication) align directly with the subparts of the E	ion since two of the course objectives (written communication and ES goal.
4. CLOSING THE LOOP	
Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported? • If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	YES NOX_ QUALIFIED Y/N YES NO QUALIFIED Y/N
Comments:	
findings. However, faculty in the department are engaged the reconsideration of their assessment strategies. It sounds like	s having occurred during the last year as a result of assessment ais year (2010-11), according to the 2009-10 annual report, in this may be one component of what sounds like a re-energizing of the capstone, organizing lower division language courses under the
SUMMARY	A come Com Tourness and
Strengths	Areas for Improvement
A specific plan for assessment is in place Student learning goals are well-articulated X Assessment methods are clearly described Assessment methods are appropriately selected Assessment methods are well-implemented Direct and indirect methods are implemented X Results are reported Results are tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is tied to evidence.)	 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. X_ A single type of assessment methods predominates. 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 RECOMMENDATION	ONS:

It appears that the department is poised to move in a productive direction with changes that have already occurred and a commitment to rethink and improve assessment, potentially paving the way for additional improvements over the next several years. Incorporating assessment activities could - and should - occur as a key component of the changes. Reviewing actual data will help faculty distinguish between anecdotal and impressionistic "findings" (i.e., "I've noted that my students usually can't....") and those that are borne out by systematically-collected data (i.e., "a review of student work samples collected from 4 sections offered during two different years showed..."). Not only will the case for change (when needed) be clearer, but it will be possible to avoid spending energy on issues which turn out to be less important, less common, or less substantive.

It is easy to focus on goals and methods when planning assessment, but it appears that the Languages Department has not been successful at using the data they have already collected. This may be because the data are not seen as programmatically relevant – but it also may be simply a lack of planning for collective analysis, discussion, and decision-making. If the latter is

the case, we would strongly encourage building in processes that will ensure such collective activities occur. Without use of data, assessment feels like busywork. Once assessment gets used, it begins to be an integral part of good teaching – which is the aim of an improved plan and process.

Chinese is one of the Languages programs which is essentially the purview of a single faculty member. Although it is especially difficult in these cases to have meaningful cross-program discussions, it may be even more important to find means of doing so – faculty who are totally immersed, all by themselves, in a single program, can quickly lose sight of the larger picture and program-wide outcomes. Forming an advisory committee may help, or simply partnering with other faculty who work with similar programs. However this is done, the point is to collect information that helps faculty develop an oversight-level understanding (and conversations) regarding student learning across the program, and then to find ways to use that understanding of learning to drive future decision-making.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

X Annual report Appendices (X Other (pleated) Previous annual rep	cited in annual report) se describe)			ent plan (as posted) ssessment review
De Ph	ame epartment none Number mail	7-4684	Sociolog _7-4419	ynn Minnotte gy krista.minnotte@und.edu
Section 1:Y	Section 2:Y	Section 3:? Sec	tion 4:N_	
Coding Key:				
	es, this is done appropria			
N = nc	o, this is not done at all,	or it is not done in relation	onship to stu	dent learning
NA = nc	information available			
? = ac	tion or progress is appar	ent; however, evidence	is lacking th	at this is completely and appropriately done

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in __2009-10 Annual Reports <u>UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS</u>

DEPARTMENT_Languages – Spanish		DATE	February 18, 2011	
COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING R	REVIEWJoan	Hawthor	ne, Krista Lynn Minnotte	
1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS				
Were any goals referenced?If so, were goals well articulated?Do goals address student learning?	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N _X QUALIFIED Y/N	
Comments: All programs in the department use the same three general a very general level (i.e., "demonstrate knowledge of tar whether this applies to them all is unclear from the report appear to be more specific and more readily assessable (ataget language"). Even within the objectives, however, literature(s)." From an outsider's perspective, it appears on what it means to "know the history" or "demonstrate language programs could more clearly specify what is most the various programs. At the least, it might be helpful the various programs. In the case of the Spanish program, the specific focus in single goal. Although it makes sense to focus on a limite it would be reasonable to ensure that learning related to Given the 11 objectives in the plan (if the Spanish prograp probably too slow to provide faculty with a useful prograf. In addition to the Departmental goals, please also considers.	rget language culti rt and plan), goals (e.g., "critically re others are quite b rs that students (ar e knowledge." It m neant by the broad if the plan indicate 2009-10 was on g ed portion of the as o all goals and obje am does indeed use am-wide overview	are(s)." In a are broken ead and inte road: "Know and faculty) whight be wordepartment ed which objectives gets a e all 11), on of learning.	at least some of these programs (a down into objectives. Those objectives a variety of literary texts in the program of the target langual within a program could easily disast considering whether individual all goals or objectives within the objectives have been selected by each ich is one of four subcomponents an every year rather than "doing assessed within three or four year, e objective per year is a pace that	nd ctives the ge gree ontext h of of a it all," s. 's
(shown in alignment within parentheses). Use 'U' (under which are similar to the referenced departmental goals.	ergraduate) or 'G' write and speak in or "be intellectually (or "be intellectually ning ("apply empir evaluatefor effectiversity and use the felong learning")	(graduate) to various sett v curious"; a ly creative"; ical dataa ctive, efficie at understar	ings with a sense of purpose/audie unalyze, synthesize, evaluate) explore, discover, engage) unalyze graphical information") ent, and ethical use") unding")	goals
Comments regarding departmental goals and alignmen	nt of departmental	goals with	institutional and Essential Studie	S

goals:

The Languages goals clearly address communication and may address diversity – although it's difficult to be certain if "demonstrate[ing] knowledge of target language culture" really addresses the same outcome as "demonstrate[ing] understanding of diversity and [being able to]use that understanding." The objective "critically analyze differences between U.S. culture and target language culture(s)," for the programs where applicable, does seem to definitely address the ES diversity goal.

The grammar goal is not directly aligned with any of the ES or institutional goals.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

Were any specific assessment methods referenced? • If so, were specifically chosen assessment		YES_X	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
•	methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? Were both direct and indirect assessment	YES_X	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
	methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach?	YES_X	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
Comments:				
assessment of decisions ab	assessment plan does not specify any methods, but the intended learning outcomes. The aim is for out appropriate methods, as well as to collect, and that plans were made for program-wide (or addings.	designated teac alyze, interpret,	chers of the , and docum	various courses to make their own nent data relevant to that course. It
program col allow faculty infinitive ver	m's report, however, does include a description of lected data in one senior level class taught in found to see student performance on various aspects of bs, gender of nouns, etc.). It is useful to examine th of which the Spanish program did.	r sections, and t f grammar (i.e.,	the selected preterite a	tool (a final exam)was subdivided to nd imperfect verbs, subjunctive and
3. ASSESS	MENT RESULTS			
Were any as	sessment 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:				
grammar. V	vriter included a detailed analysis and interpretat Veaknesses are clearly identified and differences is ceptions of their own improvements regarding gra Its summary.	between section	s and years	are also noted. Indirect assessment
'U' (undergrachievement	o departmental goals, some assessment results may aduate) or 'G' (graduate) to identify those results it. For indicated items, please describe findings in Communication – written or oral ("able to write a linking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be linking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be linking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (information literacy ("be able to access and evaluatives: ("demonstrate understanding of diversity ("demonstrate understanding of diversity Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelong Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both for	which are appl the appropriate nd speak in vari intellectually of e intellectually of "apply empirica atefor effective y and use that use glearning")	icable to instance section belatious settings urious"; and creative"; earl dataand we, efficient nderstandin	stitutional/Essential Studies goal ow s with a sense of purpose/audience") alyze, synthesize, evaluate) aplore, discover, engage) alyze graphical information"), and ethical use") g")

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:

No departmental or program-wide actions were discussed as having occurred during the last year as a result of assessment findings. However, faculty in the department are engaged this year (2010-11), according to the 2009-10 annual report, in reconsideration of their assessment strategies. It sounds like this may be one component of what sounds like a re-energizing of the curriculum generally (i.e., creating a new interdisciplinary capstone, organizing lower division language courses under the leadership of coordinators).

Within the Spanish program particularly, a number of conclusions are drawn and ideas about possible changes are presented. But there is no indication that faculty program-wide (let alone department-wide) have reviewed the results and made decisions to change aspects of the program to improve learning in the future. If these aspects of grammar are sufficiently important to be worth designating as a key learning outcome, then it seems that the findings would be worthy of discussion by faculty and curriculum review that incorporates the conclusions about needed changes in program emphases.

Areas for Improvement

SUMMARY

ŭ	•
A specific plan for assessment is in place.	No specific plan for assessment is in place.
Student learning goals are well-articulated.	Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
XAssessment methods are clearly described.	Assessment methods are not clearly described.
Assessment methods are appropriately selected.	Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
XAssessment methods are well-implemented.	Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
_X_Direct and indirect methods are implemented.	A single type of assessment methods predominates.
Results are reported.	No results are reported.
Results are tied to closing the loop.	_X_ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is tied to evidence.)	(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Strengths

It appears that the department is poised to move in a productive direction with changes that have already occurred and a commitment to rethink and improve assessment, potentially paving the way for additional improvements over the next several years. Incorporating assessment activities could – and should – occur as a key component of the changes. Reviewing actual data will help faculty distinguish between anecdotal and impressionistic "findings" (i.e., "I've noted that my students usually can't...") and those that are borne out by systematically-collected data (i.e., "a review of student work samples collected from 4 sections offered during two different years showed..."). Not only will the case for change (when needed) be clearer, but it will be possible to avoid spending energy on issues which turn out to be less important, less common, or less substantive.

It is easy to focus on goals and methods when planning assessment, but it appears that the Languages Department has not been successful at using the data they have already collected. This may be because the data are not seen as programmatically relevant – but it also may be simply a lack of planning for collective analysis, discussion, and decision-making. If the latter is the case, we would strongly encourage building in processes that will ensure such collective activities occur. Without use of data, assessment feels like busywork. Once assessment gets used, it begins to be an integral part of good teaching – which is the aim of an improved plan and process.

The Spanish program has done a great job of collecting, analyzing, and compiling evidence directly relating to one objective. Reviewers have some concern about the plausibility of spending this much time and energy on one objective out of eleven – it seems that program faculty might need to spread their energy more evenly across the four objectives under the language proficiency goal in a single year, e.g. That would necessarily mean less information about each objective, but might prove more "actionable" in the sense that program faculty would more quickly collect a program-wide overview, allowing decisions to be made about which goals or objectives require additional emphasis and where that emphasis could occur. Much though we'd like students to "know everything," they will not – so the real question is how to get the balance right amongst the various program goals. And seeing across the program is essential for that kind of decision-making.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

	ices (cited in annual report) (please describe)	_ _	_X_ Assessment plan (as post Previous assessment review	
Reviewer(s):	Name Department Phone Number e-mail		Krista Lynn Minnotte Sociology7-4419 nail.und.edu krista.minnotte	
Section 1:Y	Section 2:Y	Section 3:Y	Section 4:N	
N NA	= no information available	or it is not done in re	lationship to student learning	tely and appropriately done

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in __2009-10 Annual Reports <u>UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS</u>

DEPARTN 2011	MENT_Languages – Classics			DATEFebruary 18,
COMMIT	TEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REV	IEWJoan l	Hawthorne	e, Krista Lynn Minnotte
1. STUDEN	NT LEARNING GOALS			
•	Were any goals referenced? If so, were goals well articulated? Do goals address student learning?	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N _X QUALIFIED Y/N
a very gener whether this appear to be target langu literature(s), on what it m language pr	es in the department use the same three general legal level (i.e., "demonstrate knowledge of target legaplies to them all is unclear from the report and more specific and more readily assessable (e.g., age"). Even within the objectives, however, other." From an outsider's perspective, it appears the teans to "know the history" or "demonstrate know orgams could more clearly specify what is meaning programs. At the least, it might be helpful if the programs.	language culturd plan), goals of the control of the	re(s)." In at are broken d ad and interp oad: "Know I faculty) wit ght be worth lepartmental	least some of these programs (and fown into objectives. Those objectives beet a variety of literary texts in the the history of the target language thin a program could easily disagree a considering whether individual goals or objectives within the context
No Classics	report was submitted for 2009-10 and no work w	vas completed o	on assessmer	nt during that year.
(shown in al which are six12 '3 '4 '5 1x67 18 \$	to the Departmental goals, please also consider U dignment within parentheses). Use 'U' (undergramilar to the referenced departmental goals. Communication – written or oral ("able to write Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluative of the department of the communication of the communic	duate) or 'G' (go and speak in very intellectually one intellectually ("apply empiricatefor effect sity and use that g learning") or their communication.	arious settin curious"; an creative"; e cal dataan ive, efficien t understand ities and for	identify UND/Essential Studies goals gs with a sense of purpose/audience") alyze, synthesize, evaluate) explore, discover, engage) alyze graphical information") t, and ethical use") ing")
comments r goals:	regarding departmental goals and alignment of	departmental g	goals with in	stitutional and Essential Studies
"demonstrat understandi	ges goals clearly address communication and mate[ing] knowledge of target language culture" reing of diversity and [being able to]use that unders and target language culture(s)," for the programal.	cally addresses standing." The	the same out objective "c	tcome as "demonstrate[ing] ritically analyze differences between
2. ASSESS	MENT METHODS			
Were any sp	Decific assessment methods referenced? If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals?	YES_X YESX	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N

•	Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach?	YES	NO_x_	QUALIFIED Y/N
Comments:				
assessment of decisions abo	assessment plan does not specify any methods, but the intended learning outcomes. The aim is for out appropriate methods, as well as to collect, an ear that plans were made for program-wide (or a dings.	designated to alyze, interp	eachers of the ret, and docun	various courses to make their own ment data relevant to that course. It
	m's report, however, does include a description oven that no assessment was conducted during that		tion methods i	used during 2009-10. Classics is the
3. ASSESSI	MENT RESULTS			
Were any ass	If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? Were the results tied to goals for student learning?	YES	NO_X_	QUALIFIED Y/N
		YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
		YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
•		YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
Comments:				
No assessme	nt was conducted within Classics in 2009-10.			
'U' (undergr achievement 1 C 3 T 4 T 5 I 6 I 7 I	o departmental goals, some assessment results manaduate) or 'G' (graduate) to identify those results. For indicated items, please describe findings in Communication – written or oral ("able to write a Chinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be Chinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be Chinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (nformation literacy ("be able to access and evaluative communication of diversity") ("demonstrate understanding of diversity in the discovery described on	which are ap the appropris nd speak in v intellectually e intellectually "apply empir atefor effect y and use that g learning")	oplicable to instate section belification belification settings of curious; and the curious; ending the curious and the curiou	stitutional/Essential Studies goal low s with a sense of purpose/audience") alyze, synthesize, evaluate) xplore, discover, engage) alyze graphical information") t, and ethical use") ag")
Comments r	egarding results and the application of results to) department	al, institution	al and Essential Studies goals:
No assessme described in	nt was conducted and therefore there are no ES t the plan.	results – altho	ough there wo	uld be if assessment occurred as
4. CLOSIN	G THE LOOP			
Were any act results report	tions taken on the basis of assessment ted? If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?			QUALIFIED Y/N
Comments:	ancety address goals for student realining?	11.0	110	QUALITED 1/14

No departmental or program-wide actions were discussed as having occurred during the last year as a result of assessment findings. However, faculty in the department are engaged this year (2010-11), according to the 2009-10 annual report, in reconsideration of their assessment strategies. It sounds like this may be one component of what sounds like a re-energizing of the curriculum generally (i.e., creating a new interdisciplinary capstone, organizing lower division language courses under the leadership of coordinators).

the curriculum generally (i.e., creating a new interdisciplinary capstone, organizing lower division language courses under the leadership of coordinators).						
SUMMARY						
Strengths	Areas for Improvement					
A specific plan for assessment is in place.	No specific plan for assessment is in place.					

A specific plan for assessment is in place.	No specific plan for assessment is in place.
Student learning goals are well-articulated.	Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
Assessment methods are clearly described.	Assessment methods are not clearly described.
Assessment methods are appropriately selected.	Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
Assessment methods are well-implemented.	_X Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
Direct and indirect methods are implemented.	A single type of assessment methods predominates.
Results are reported.	_X No results are reported.
Results are tied to closing the loop.	Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is tied to evidence.)	(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

It appears that the department is poised to move in a productive direction with changes that have already occurred and a commitment to rethink and improve assessment, potentially paving the way for additional improvements over the next several years. Incorporating assessment activities could – and should – occur as a key component of the changes. Reviewing actual data will help faculty distinguish between anecdotal and impressionistic "findings" (i.e., "I've noted that my students usually can't...") and those that are borne out by systematically-collected data (i.e., "a review of student work samples collected from 4 sections offered during two different years showed..."). Not only will the case for change (when needed) be clearer, but it will be possible to avoid spending energy on issues which turn out to be less important, less common, or less substantive.

It is easy to focus on goals and methods when planning assessment, but it appears that the Languages Department has not been successful at using the data they have already collected. This may be because the data are not seen as programmatically relevant – but it also may be simply a lack of planning for collective analysis, discussion, and decision-making. If the latter is the case, we would strongly encourage building in processes that will ensure such collective activities occur. Without use of data, assessment feels like busywork. Once assessment gets used, it begins to be an integral part of good teaching – which is the aim of an improved plan and process.

In the case of the Classics program, assessment did not occur because the single faculty member with responsibility for the program has been on long term leave. It is obviously critical to the program that the issue be resolved – and, at that time, the Classics program will benefit by joining other Language programs in assessment activities. The needs will be very similar to those in other programs under the leadership of a single faculty member, and perhaps those programs can serve as models for quickly and effectively getting assessment on track within the Classics program.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

	l report ces (cited in annual report) (please describe)		_X Assessment plan (as posted) Previous assessment review	
Previous annua	*			
Reviewer(s):	Name Department Phone Number e-mail	Joan Hawthorne Academic Affairs 7-4684 joan.hawthorne@em	Krista Lynn Minnotte Sociology7-4419 aail.und.edu krista.minnotte@und.edu	
Section 1:Y_	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