

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2010-11
Annual Reports

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Atmospheric Sciences **DATE** February 6, 2011

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Sukhvarsh Jerath and Joan Hawthorne

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: Goals are well articulated.

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> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |

Comments: The department of atmospheric science has asked graduates to complete a survey. Direct methods are also described but results of those methods are not reported (perhaps because of the very small sample size, or perhaps because the methods were not implemented in 2010-11).

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> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |
| • Were the results tied to goals for student learning? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u>X</u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments: The report does not make clear if the data was collected from theses defenses and how it was used. It is suggested to collect data over a period of time, given the small student size, to make the sample bigger – despite the general principle that departments might rotate methods or goals (i.e., collecting some data yearly, but not necessarily implementing every aspect of the plan during every year).

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: The department identified two deficiencies and changes made from the data gathered in 2009 – 2010.

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 plan for collecting data is good. We recommend that the graduate program should collect data regularly, over a period of time, because they have a small student sample pool in a single year.

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

Reviewer(s):	Name	<u> Sukhvarsh Jerath </u>	<u> Joan Hawthorne </u>
	Department	<u> Civil Engineering </u>	<u> Academic Affairs </u>
	Phone Number	<u> 7-3564 </u>	<u> 7-4684 </u>
	e-mail	<u>sukhvarsh.jerath@engr.und.edu</u>	<u>joan.hawthorne@email.und.edu</u>

Section 1: Y Section 2: Y Section 3: N 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 _2010-11_ Annual Reports
UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Atmospheric Sciences **DATE** February 3, 2012

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Joan Hawthorne, Sukhvarsh Jerath

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 department cites a thorough list of goals in the annual report, and that list is the same as the one in the assessment plan.

In addition to the Departmental goals, please also consider UND's Institutional and Essential Studies goals for student learning (shown in alignment within parentheses) and identify which goals are similar to departmental goals.

- 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”)
 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:

Both the thinking and reasoning ES goals and the communication ES goals align well with departmental goals for learning.

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:

A good assortment of methods are identified and implemented. This continued to be the case in 2010-11 when both indirect and direct methods, both explicitly aligned with intended learning outcomes, were used.

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:

With such purposeful alignment between goals and methods, and with regular implementation of methods, it makes sense that results would be clear in their meaning. Assessments conducted within the capstone course provided information about five of the department's intended learning outcomes, and the senior survey provided information about all eight outcomes.

In addition to departmental goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. Indicate any goals for which the department presents findings, and, for indicated items, describe findings below. .

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

Comments regarding results and the application of results to departmental, institutional and Essential Studies goals:

Departmental data indicate that learning is occurring around each of the ES goals which are addressed in the program, although they also are working to enhance learning related to written communication. Changes in this area were made in response to previous assessment reports, and additional changes are planned to occur in response to the latest findings.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?

YES ☒ NO ☐ 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:

It's good to see that you continue to work toward improvement of learning outcomes in areas where performance is not measuring up to departmental expectations. We'll be interested to see, in future reports, whether your efforts at curriculum revision have the desired impact. But we do note that your ideas seem well thought out and supported by the evidence you've been collecting.

SUMMARY

Strengths

Areas 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.
☐ 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 Atmospheric Sciences report on assessment within the undergraduate program provides a textbook-perfect example of a situation where assessment is thoughtfully designed and systematically executed. It appears that you have a system in place for ensuring that data are regularly collected and, equally important, discussed and used in departmental planning.

Furthermore, your report indicates that you (and your students) are gaining value from your work – which is exactly what we'd hope to see when assessment is thoroughly incorporated into the departmental culture.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

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

☒ Assessment plan (as posted)
☒ Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	<u>Joan Hawthorne</u>	<u>Sukhvarsh Jerath</u>	_____
	Department	<u>Academic Affairs</u>	<u>Civil Engineering</u>	_____
	Phone Number	<u>7-4684</u>	<u>7-3564</u>	_____
	e-mail	joan.hawthorne@email.und.edu sukhvarsh.jerath@engr.und.edu_____		

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