

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in FY 2010 Annual Reports
GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT MA, MS & PhD in GeologyDATE 03/28/12COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Roxanne Hurley & Paul Drechsel**1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS**

- Were any goals referenced? YES X NO QUALIFIED Y/N
- If so, were goals well articulated? YES NO QUALIFIED Y/N X
- Do goals address student learning? YES NO QUALIFIED Y/N X

Comments: The Assessment Plan posted is dated 2004-2005. There are 8 student learning goals with one objective for each goal. Several goals clearly articulated student learning objectives, however some address program goals, not student learning (“graduates of our program shall be employable”, “faculty who teach & advise graduate students shall be actively engaged in research...”).

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

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

Comments: Assessment methods are (faculty evaluation of theses & dissertations, course work) as direct measures and alumni surveys as indirect measures. They are tied to a specific objective. Not all objectives had a clear assessment method identified. GPA is not a direct measure because it cannot be related back to individual student learning.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

- Were any assessment results reported? YES NO X 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: There is no assessment data reported in the annual reports for this program.

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: The Assessment Plan identifies who is responsible and how the “closing the loop” process is to occur. Without specific data reported we are unable to determine if the student learning goals were addressed and if any “closing the loop” activities occurred.

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 Geology Graduate program has an assessment plan in place but it was last updated in 2004. It is recommended that the Student Learning Goals and Objectives be reviewed to more directly address student learning. 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.

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	Paul Drechsel
	Department	Nursing	Aerospace
	Phone Number	7-4525	7-4923
	e-mail	roxanne.hurley@email.und.edu	drechsel@aero.und.edu

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

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in FY 2010 Annual Reports
UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT B.S. in Geology DATE 03/28/12

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Roxanne Hurley, Paul Drechsel

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: The entire Assessment Report Fall 2010 was found on the departmental Assessment Plan website. There are 3 student learning goals/objectives identified. Objectives 1 & 2 clearly articulate student learning. Objective 3 is less clear as it states, "student will present results of their personally conducted & completed geologic research through their senior thesis". While the activity the student must accomplish is clear, the expected learning outcome is less clear. Wording this objective in terms that address student learning may be helpful to clarify what students are expected to know by the end of the Senior Thesis.

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.

- 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")
- X 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: The departmental goals 1 & 2 identify the ability of students to demonstrate their knowledge, synthesize & evaluate geological understanding which supports the ES goals of "Thinking & reasoning – creative thinking". ES goals of "Quantitative reasoning, information literacy & communication" appear to align with objective 3 as students complete a Senior Thesis and present the results.

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 Knowledge Surveys given at the beginning & end of each course; a Capstone Exam; Faculty Evaluation of the Capstone presentation (using a rubric) and Faculty Assessment of the Senior Thesis Oral Presentation (using a rubric). Indirect methods include the use of peer evaluation of the senior oral presentation.

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? YES ____ NO ____ QUALIFIED Y/N X
- Were the results tied to goals for student learning? YES ____ NO ____ QUALIFIED Y/N X

Comments: The report provided a table to demonstrate that Knowledge Surveys are being used in the geology courses and when the course began using them. No data was provided on the scores attained by students on the knowledge surveys. A table showing the faculty assessment of the oral research presentation of the students who have graduated since 2005 was provided, however of the 11 students completing the project only 4 faculty forms were available for analysis. Results reported did demonstrate that those students are meeting student learning objectives 1 & 2. Capstone exam results for 2009 and 2010 were reported and results were tied to the goals for student learning. Data from the Capstone presentation were not reported.

Indirect student peer assessment data were not reported.

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”)
- X 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:

It would be helpful to have results of the Knowledge Surveys’ reported to demonstrate the ongoing development of students thinking and reasoning. Results reported on the Assessment of the Senior Thesis Oral Presentation clearly indicated that those students are meeting oral communication, information literacy, and quantitative reasoning goals.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

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

- 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 report spoke to changes being made within the department to improve the collection of data by faculty and methods to standardize the assessment process. 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 geology assessment plan is in place and some data is collected each year. The department report makes note that they are aware of the need to improve data collection and standardize the process in order to determine if student learning outcomes are being met. It may be beneficial to review the student learning objectives to ensure that they articulate student learning outcomes. It is recommended that only the assessment plan be placed on the Assessment Plan website and that the yearly assessment report be included in the departmental annual report each year. It is appreciated the amount of work completed on data collection by faculty. We are looking forward to curricular or program changes as a result of these assessments.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

- ☒ Annual report
☐ Appendices (cited in annual report)
☐ Other (please describe)
- ☒ Assessment plan (as posted)
☒ Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	Roxanne Hurley	Paul Drechsel
	Department	Nursing	Aerospace
	Phone Number	7-4525	7-4923
	e-mail	roxanne.hurley@email.und.edu	drechsel@aero.und.edu

Section 1: ? Section 2: Y Section 3: ? Section 4: ?

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