UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2010 Annual Reports

<u>UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS</u>

DEPARTMENT	Social Science Major			DATE	03/25/11		
COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW <u>Roxanne Hurley, Fred Remer</u>							
1. STUDENT LEARNING	GOALS						
Were any goals referenced?If so, were goals well-articulated?Do goals address student learning?			NO NO NO	QUALIFIE QUALIFIE QUALIFIE	D Y/N		
Comments:							
(shown in alignment within to the referenced department of the referenced of the reference of	ntal goals, please also consider Uparentheses). Use 'U' (undergratal goals. written or oral ("able to write an oning – critical thinking (or "be oning – quantitative reasoning ("y ("be able to access and evalual strate understanding of diversity "commit themselves to lifelong of ("share responsibility both for attential goals and alignment of	aduate) to ide ad speak in va- intellectually intellectually apply empiritefor effect and use that learning") their communication	rious settings values of curious settings values of creative; expected dataanalytive, efficient, anderstanding of the curious and for the curious setting and for the curious setting of the curious settin	with a sense of yze, synthesizolore, discoveryze graphical and ethical use")	goals which are similar f purpose/audience") e, evaluate) r, engage) information") e")		
2. ASSESSMENT METH	ODS						
• If so, were spe	cific assessment methods referenced? If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual	YES	NO	QUALIFIE	D Y/N		
goals?	ect and indirect assessment	YES	NO	QUALIFIE	D Y/N		
	as components of a "multiple	YES	NO	QUALIFIE	D Y/N		

Comments:

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS						
Were any assessment results reported?	YES	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			
 If so, were the results clear in terms of how 						
they indicate need for improvement?	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N			
 Were the results tied to goals for student 						
learning?	YES	_ NO	QUALIFIED Y/N			
Comments:						
'U' (undergraduate) to identify those results which are applicated items, please describe findings in the appropriate se 1 Communication – written or oral ("able to write and 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be in 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be in 4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning ("a 5 Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluate 6 Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of diversity a 7 Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelong learning ("share responsibility both for the Comments regarding results and the application of results to the Comments regarding results and the application of results to the Comments regarding results and the application of results to the Comments regarding results and the application of results to the Comments regarding results and the application of results to the Comments regarding results and the application of results to the Comments regarding results and the application of results to the Comments regarding results and the application of results to the Comments regarding results and the application of results to the Comments regarding results and the application of results to the Comments regarding results and the application of results to the Comments regarding results and the application of results to the Comments regarding results and the application of results to the Comments regarding results and the application of results to the Comments regarding results and the application of results to the Comments regarding results and the application of results to the Comments regarding results and the application of results to the Comments regarding results and the application of results to the Comments regarding results and the application of results and the application	ction belo speak in value tellectually pellectually empi efor effectual tellectually pellectually empi efor effectually earning the tellectual pellectually empired the tellectual tellectually empired the tellectual tellectually empired the tellectual tellect	w various settings ly curious"; ana ly creative"; exprical dataana ective, efficient, at understanding	with a sense of purpose/audience") lyze, synthesize, evaluate) plore, discover, engage) lyze graphical information") , and ethical use") g") the world")			
Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N			
If so, do curricular or other improvements/	120					
changes arising from assessment results						
directly address goals for student learning?	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N			
Comments: SUMMARY						
Strengths		Areas for Improvement				
A specific plan for assessment is in place.	_X 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.	Assessment methods are not well-implemented.					
Direct and indirect methods are implemented.			ssessment methods predominates.			
Results are reported.		results are repo				
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:

There is no Assessment Plan developed for this major as there are very few students still using this major since a Bachelor of General Studies was developed (reported by Associate Dean of Arts and Science, Dr. Tom Rand). It is recommended that if this major remains as an option for students in the College of Arts and Sciences an Assessment Plan should be developed.

X Annual report ___ Assessment plan (as posted) _____ Appendices (cited in annual report) ___ Previous assessment review ____ Other (please describe) Reviewer(s): Name Roxanne Hurley Fred Remer Department Nursing Aerospace 7-4525 7-4055 Phone Number e-mail roxanne.hurley@email.und.edu remer@aero.und.edu Section 1: N Section 2: N Section 3: N Section 4: N Coding Key: = 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

= action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done

MATERIALS REVIEWED

NA = no information available