## UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

# Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2010 Annual Reports $\underline{UNDERGRADUATE\ PROGRAMS}$

DEPARTMENT_Philosophy & Religion –	Philosophy ConcentrationDATEApril 20, 2011
COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTI	ING REVIEW_Cassie Gerhardt & Ruth Paur
1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS	
<ul><li>Were any goals referenced?</li><li>If so, were goals well articulated?</li><li>Do goals address student learning?</li></ul>	YES_X_         NO         QUALIFIED Y/N           YES_X_         NO         QUALIFIED Y/N           YES_X_         NO         QUALIFIED Y/N
example: Goal 1: Students will develop the abilit Objective 1.1 Demonstrate the Objective 1.2 Demonstrate the Objective 1.3 Demonstrate the	ng goals as well as 2 – 3 specific objectives for each of the goals. For ty to think critically. e skills necessary to the critical thinking process. e ability to analyze complex arguments. e ability to formulate and communicate arguments. ment's assessment plan as posted on the UND Assessment Plan website.
(shown in alignment within parentheses). Use 'U to the referenced departmental goals. X1 Communication – written or oral ("abX2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinX3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thi4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitativeX5 Information literacy ("be able to acceX6 Diversity ("demonstrate understandin7 Lifelong learning ("commit themselved")	
Comments regarding departmental goals and aligoals:	ignment of departmental goals with institutional and Essential Studies
The stated learning goals and objectives align v	with 5 of the Essential Studies goals.
2. ASSESSMENT METHODS	
<ul> <li>Were any specific assessment methods referenced</li> <li>If so, were specifically chosen assess methods appropriately aligned with a goals?</li> <li>Were both direct and indirect assess methods used as components of a "n measures" approach?</li> </ul>	sment individual YES NOX QUALIFIED Y/N ment

### Comments:

The assessment methods identified in both the annual report and posted assessment plan were identical and indicate a comprehensive, multi-year approach to program assessment. Assessment methods include mid-program review/exit interviews, examples of assignments from departmental majors, surveys of departmental majors, focus groups, and alumni surveys. Each year, 3 of the 5 identified assessment methods are implemented. Neither the annual report nor the posted assessment plan identify how the stated methods align with the department's specific student learning goals and objectives.

In addition to addressing assessment methods, the annual report and assessment plan identify the specific individual(s) who are responsible for implementing the various aspects of the department's assessment plan. For example, the department chair is responsible for recruiting members to the Department Program Committee (DPC). The members of the DPC are responsible for collecting data, preparing materials for the annual departmental program meeting, and for producing a final report after the annual departmental program meeting.

•	A CC	DOON	ATTENDED.	DECIH	TO
٠.	V C.C.	1.0.0.1	/ H. N. I. I.		1.6

Were any assessment results reported?	YES_X	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
<ul> <li>If so, were the results clear in terms of they specifically affirm achievement of</li> </ul>		NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
<ul> <li>If so, were the results clear in terms of they indicate need for improvement?</li> </ul>	YES_X	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
<ul> <li>Were the results tied to goals for studer learning?</li> </ul>	nt YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N X

#### Comments:

The assessment results reported focus on an analysis of assignments/papers from departmental majors collected during Spring 2010. The report includes the 7 factor rubric used to evaluate the papers as well the 5 point scale used to measure each factor. A total of 8 papers were evaluated and average scores for each factor are included in the report. In addition, the report includes the evaluators overall assessment of the results.

The reported results were clear in terms of how they affirm achievement of the specific factors of this rubric and method. The results also indicate the areas in which improvement is needed, but the results were not as clear in terms of how they tied to the department's stated learning goals and objectives.

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")
X 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be intellectually curious"; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)
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 departmental, institutional and Essential Studies goals:

Based on the assessment method used and the stated results, the department recognizes that critical thinking is being achieved by students.

4. CLOSING T	THE LOOP						
results reported?  • If s cha	is taken on the basis of so, do curricular or other anges arising from asse ectly address goals for	er improvements/ ssment results	YES			QUALIFIED Y/1 QUALIFIED Y/1	
	nt notes, "We do not have, but rather plan to um revisions".						
SUMMARY	Strengths			Aı	reas foi	r Improvement	
_XStudent lea_XAssessmen_XAssessmen_XDirect and_XResults are(Decision-OVERALL States of the control	e plan for assessment is arning goals are well-arning methods are clearly don't methods are approprint methods are well-impindirect methods are interpreted.  The time the time indirect methods are interpreted. The time to closing the loop making is tied to evide to evide to evide to evide to the time to a department methods are approprint methods to their states.	ticulated. escribed. ately selected. olemented. nplemented. o. nce.) ECOMMENDATI ntal priority. The dejopriate and include b	StAsAsAsNoRo (C)  ONS:  partment's oth direct a	udent learningsessment massessment massessment massessment massessment massessment massessment massessment are esults are not decision-maked student learnand indirect in	ng goal ethods ethods of asses reporte t clearly king is a	y tied to closing to the directly tied to the directly tied to the directly articals. The departme	iculated. escribed. tely selected. lemented. oredominates. he loop. o evidence.) ulated and the nt is encouraged to
MATERIALS IX Annual Appendic Other (ple	report ces (cited in annual repo	ort)		Assessment Previous asse			
Reviewer(s):	Name Department Phone Number e-mail	Ruth Paur Pathology 7-2651 ruth.paur@med	l.und.edu	Cassie Ger Memorial U 7-3667 cassie.gerh	Union	email.und.edu	
Section 1:Y_ Coding Key:	Section 2:?						
Y = N =	yes, this is done appropriate no, this is not done at no information availa	all, or it is not done	in relations	ship to stude	nt learr	ning	

S:\Assessment Committee\Annual Assessment Reviews\2010-2011\Academic Review\UAC Academic Reviews2010-11\Approved\Philosophy & Religion - Philosophy Concentration.docx

= 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 2010 Annual Reports $\underline{UNDERGRADUATE\ PROGRAMS}$

DEPARTM	ENT_Philosophy & Religion – Religion	Concentratio	onDAT	TEApril 20, 2011
COMMITT	EE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REV	IEWCassi	e Gerhar	dt & Ruth Paur
1. STUDENT	T LEARNING GOALS			
• I	Were any goals referenced? If so, were goals well articulated? Oo goals address student learning?	YES_X_	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N
example: Goal	ent has identified 5 student learning goals as  1: Students will develop the ability to think Objective 1.1 Demonstrate the skills nec Objective 1.2 Demonstrate the ability to Objective 1.3 Demonstrate the ability to	critically. essary to the c analyze comp formulate and	ritical thin lex argum l commun	nking process. ents. icate arguments.
i nese goais v	were also identified in the department's asse	ssment pian as	s postea or	i the UND Assessment Plan Website.
(shown in alig to the reference	the Departmental goals, please also consider Unment within parentheses). Use 'U' (undergrated departmental goals. ommunication – written or oral ("able to write hinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "binking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "hinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning aformation literacy ("be able to access and evaluiversity ("demonstrate understanding of diversity ("demonstrate understanding of diversity ("share responsibility both for	duate) to identi- and speak in va- be intellectually be intellectuall ("apply empiri- uatefor effec- ity and use that g learning") r their commun	arious setting curious"; y creative" cal dataa ctive, efficient understandaties and formaties and	ngs with a sense of purpose/audience") analyze, synthesize, evaluate) c; explore, discover, engage) analyze graphical information") ent, and ethical use") ding") or the world")
Comments reg goals:	garding departmental goals and alignment of	departmental g	goals with	institutional and Essential Studies
The stated lea	arning goals and objectives align with 5 of th	e Essential St	udies goals	S.
2. ASSESSM	IENT METHODS			
• I r g • V	cific 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 YES YESX	NO_X_	-

### Comments:

The assessment methods identified in both the annual report and posted assessment plan were identical and indicate a comprehensive, multi-year approach to program assessment. Assessment methods include mid-program review/exit interviews, examples of assignments from departmental majors, surveys of departmental majors, focus groups, and alumni surveys. Each year, 3 of the 5 identified assessment methods are implemented. Neither the annual report nor the posted assessment plan identify how the stated methods align with the department's specific student learning goals and objectives.

In addition to addressing assessment methods, the annual report and assessment plan identify the specific individual(s) who are responsible for implementing the various aspects of the department's assessment plan. For example, the department chair is responsible for recruiting members to the Department Program Committee (DPC). The members of the DPC are responsible for collecting data, preparing materials for the annual departmental program meeting, and for producing a final report after the annual departmental program meeting.

2	ACCECCMEN	T DECLII TO	7
•	ACCHOOMEN	T KHNIII IN	۰

Were any asse	essment 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
t	If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?  Were the results tied to goals for student	YES_X	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
	learning?	YES_X	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N

#### Comments:

The assessment results reported address a focus group assessment project involving religion majors during Spring 2010. Specifically, the program focused on student learning goal #1, "students will develop the ability to think critically". Thirteen religion majors were shown a short video clip and asked to respond to a question through a written essay. Three religion faculty members scored the essays using an established rubric. The rubric and assessment results are included in the annual report.

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.

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")
X2 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 departmental, institutional and Essential Studies goals:

Based on the assessment method used and the stated results, it is clear that critical thinking is being achieved by students.

In addition, the department noted opportunities to develop their assessment methodology by formulating additional and more substantive questions by which to evaluate student progress with other program goals.

4. CLOSING	THE LOOP					
results reported  • If ch	ns taken on the basis of? so, do curricular or oth tanges arising from asserectly address goals for	er improvements/ ssment results	YES		QUALIFIED Y/N	
as reported ab					based on the assessment work, and will integrate those resu	
SUMMARY	Strengths			Area	ns for Improvement	
X_Student le X_Assessme X_Assessme X_Assessme X_Direct and X_Results are (Decision  OVERALL S  It is clear that a identified asses	e tied to closing the loop -making is tied to evide SUMMARY AND RI ssessment is a department	rticulated.  lescribed.  ately selected.  plemented.  nplemented.  c.  nce.)  ECOMMENDATI  ental priority. The described.	South direct	udent learning ssessment meth ssessment meth ssessment meth single type of o results are re- esults are not co decision-makin	for assessment is in place. goals are not well-articulated. nods are not clearly described. nods are not appropriately selected assessment methods predominate ported. learly tied to closing the loop. g is not directly tied to evidence ago goals are well articulated and ethods. The department is encounted.	es)
MATERIALS	REVIEWED					
	l report ces (cited in annual rep lease describe)	ort)		Assessment p Previous assess		
Reviewer(s):	Name Department Phone Number e-mail	-			ion dt@email.und.edu	
Section 1:Y	Section 2:?					
N = NA =	<ul> <li>yes, this is done appression, this is not done a</li> <li>no information avails</li> <li>action or progress is</li> </ul>	t all, or it is not done able		-	learning s is completely and appropriately	y done