

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

DEPARTMENT Psychology DATE 03/28/11

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Roxanne Hurley, Fred Remer

**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>    </u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u>    |
| • Do goals address student learning?  | YES <u>    </u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u>    |

**Comments:** Most undergraduate assessment goals are well articulated. We note that goal #5 looks at the student experience in the psychology department rather than addressing a student learning objective. Goal #6 assesses whether students engage in experiential learning but does not specifically address student learning. Goal #7 lists Diversity, but there is no student learning goal or objective articulated. Having these worded in terms that address student learning may be helpful to clarify what students are expected to know by the end of 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.

- |             |   |  |
|-------------|---|--|
| <u>X</u>    | 1 | Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”) |
| <u>X</u>    | 2 | Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)       |
| <u>X</u>    | 3 | Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage)          |
| <u>X</u>    | 4 | Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”)         |
| <u>    </u> | 5 | Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”)              |
| <u>X</u>    | 6 | Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”)                               |
| <u>    </u> | 7 | Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)   |
| <u>X</u>    | 8 | Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)                        |

**Comments regarding departmental goals and alignment of departmental goals with institutional and Essential Studies goals:** One goal addresses written communication, three goals address various aspects of thinking and reasoning and one goal addresses engaging in experiential learning (service/citizenship). Diversity is identified in the Assessment plan but no student learning objectives are developed.

**2. ASSESSMENT METHODS**

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

**Comments:** Direct methods utilized include use of the Area Concentration Achievement Test (ACAT) and the Psychology department writing assessment instrument. Indirect methods include the use of focus groups to get feedback on satisfaction with the department experiences. Data is also collected to identify the percentage of students who enroll in Psych 395/397 Experiential Learning courses and the number of graduates who have completed a course designated as a “U” or a “G”

### 3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported? YES X NO \_\_\_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N \_\_\_\_

- If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? YES X NO \_\_\_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N \_\_\_\_
- If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? YES X NO \_\_\_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N \_\_\_\_
- Were the results tied to goals for student learning? YES X NO \_\_\_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N \_\_\_\_

**Comments:** Direct results of the Area Concentration Achievement Test: History & Systems subtest, Experimental Design & Statistics subtest, and overall exam score are reported for 2009 and the past five years as a percentage of majors who have achieved a rank of 50% or higher. Written papers were analyzed using the department writing assessment instrument and reported as a percentage of papers judged to be “average” or “above average”. Number of graduates who enrolled in experiential learning was reported by percentage. No data was reported for Goal #7 on Diversity.

Indirect focus groups data was reported as “there is a mixture of satisfaction and concern that is difficult to summarize in a few sentences”. The assessment method discussed “feedback themes” so it may be useful for the department to report the data using themes that arise from the focus groups.

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. .

- X 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)
- X 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”)
- \_\_\_\_ 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 results and the application of results to departmental, institutional and Essential Studies goals:**

Results for 2009 do not meet the benchmark set by the department for goal #1(history), #2 (thinking & reasoning), #3 (broad background of knowledge) and #6 (experiential learning). In 2009 – 80% of papers were graded as “average” or “above average” which met the departmental expectation and written communication ES goal. The percentage of students completing experiential learning courses has not yet met the departmental goal.

### 4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported? YES \_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N X

- If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning? YES \_\_\_\_ NO X QUALIFIED Y/N \_\_\_\_

**Comments:** The only action reported was in relation to the student focus groups “that the department continues to look at ways to address the major concerns that students describe”. No curricular or program changes were reported that were tied to the assessment results.

## 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 undergraduate psychology department assessment plan is in place and data is collected each year. It may be beneficial to review the goals to ensure that they articulate student learning objectives. The data is reported well but there is no clear evidence of how that data is used and whether any action is taken in the department, especially when the data indicates that the learning goals were not met. There are identified curricular changes in the 2009 annual report but they are not linked to the assessment plan data. It is recommended that the yearly assessment report be included in the departmental annual report each year. This review was based on 2009 data as the FY 2010 report was not made available.

## MATERIALS REVIEWED

- ☒ Annual report
- ☐ Appendices (cited in annual report)
- ☒ Other (please describe) Assessment Results 2009 found on UG Department website.
- ☒ Assessment plan (as posted)
- ☒ Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	Roxanne Hurley	Fred Remer
	Department	Nursing	Aerospace
	Phone Number	7-4525	7-4055
	e-mail	<a href="mailto:roxanne.hurley@email.und.edu">roxanne.hurley@email.und.edu</a>	<a href="mailto:remmer@aero.und.edu">remmer@aero.und.edu</a>

Section 1: ?\_ Section 2: Y\_ Section 3: Y\_ 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 FY2009 Annual Reports**  
**GRADUATE PROGRAMS**

**DEPARTMENT** PhD Clinical Psychology **DATE** 04/04/11

**COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW** Roxanne Hurley & Fred Remer

**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:** There are four primary goals with clearly articulated student learning objectives and competencies for each goal.

**2. ASSESSMENT METHODS**

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

**Comments:** Each objective has a target criterion and clearly identified assessment method. Direct measures such as course grades and/or standardized exam scores are utilized as well as indirect measures through an annual student survey (current students and alumni survey).

**3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS**

- |  |              |              |                         |
|--|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Were any assessment results reported?  | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>  </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>  </u> |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals? | YES <u>X</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>X</u> | NO <u>  </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>  </u> |
| • Were the results tied to goals for student learning?   | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>  </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>  </u> |

**Comments:** Outcome data and student survey data are clearly reported for each objective.

**4. CLOSING THE LOOP**

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

**Comments:** A detailed description is given on how the department completes the assessment process (closing the loop). Several examples were given on how data was discussed and recommended changes in the program were initiated.

## 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 Clinical Psychology PhD program has a very ambitious and dynamic assessment plan. It is clear that the department implements the assessment process fully and makes program changes based on the assessment results. It is recommended that course grades not be used as an assessment measure, as they are too broad and cannot identify how or whether a particular goal was met. It is also recommended that the yearly assessment report be included in the departmental annual report each year.

## MATERIALS REVIEWED

- ☒ Annual report
- ☐ Appendices (cited in annual report)
- ☐ Other (please describe)

- ☒ Assessment plan (as posted) **2010 results included**
- ☐ Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	Roxanne Hurley	Fred Remer
	Department	Nursing	Aerospace
	Phone Number	7-4525	7-4055
	e-mail	<a href="mailto:roxanne.hurley@email.und.edu">roxanne.hurley@email.und.edu</a>	<a href="mailto:remmer@aero.und.edu">remmer@aero.und.edu</a>

Section 1: ☒ Y Section 2: ☒ Y Section 3: ☒ Y Section 4: ☒ Y

### Coding Key:

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

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

**DEPARTMENT** MA & PhD in General/Experimental Psychology **DATE** 04/04/11

**COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW** Roxanne Hurley & Fred Remer

**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 Assessment Plan has Two Goals with several clearly articulated student learning objectives for each goal. The currently posted plan is dated 11/3/06.

**2. ASSESSMENT METHODS**

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

**Comments:** Assessment methods are discussed (course exams, written work, comprehensive exams, oral defense, etc.) as direct measures and student course and program surveys as indirect measures but they are not tied to a specific objective. It would be helpful to articulate the specific assessment method to be used for each objective.

**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>X</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>X</u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>  </u> |
| • Were the results tied to goals for student learning?   | YES <u>  </u> | NO <u>X</u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>  </u> |

**Comments:** There is no assessment data reported in the annual report for this program.

**4. CLOSING THE LOOP**

- |  |               |              |                         |
|--|---------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?  | YES <u>  </u> | NO <u>  </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u>  |
| • If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning? | YES <u>  </u> | NO <u>  </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>  </u> |

**Comments:** The Assessment Plan identifies who is responsible and how the “closing the loop” process is to occur. The department annual assessment report states, “data from the general/experimental psychology graduate programs

suggest that the programs are improving across time. Thus, the department plans to continue to implement the policies and procedures that it currently practices”. Without specific data reported we are unable to determine if the student learning goals were addressed when decisions were made to continue the current plan.

## 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/Experimental MA & PhD program has an assessment plan in place but it was last updated in 2006. There are clearly articulated Student Learning Goals and Objectives. It is recommended that the assessment methods be tied directly to each specific learning objective to more clearly identify how each goal is met. We also recommend that results of the Assessment Plan be posted in the annual report each year and the program more clearly articulates how decision-making is tied to the assessment results. This review was based on the FY 2009 annual report as the 2010 report was not made available.

## 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 type="checkbox"/> Previous assessment review             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe)             |   |

Reviewer(s):	Name	Roxanne Hurley	Fred Remer
	Department	Nursing	Aerospace
	Phone Number	7-4525	7-4055
	e-mail	<a href="mailto:roxanne.hurley@email.und.edu">roxanne.hurley@email.und.edu</a>	<a href="mailto:remmer@aero.und.edu">remmer@aero.und.edu</a>

Section 1: ☒ Y    Section 2: ☐ ?    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