

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in __2010-11__ Annual Reports
GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Space Studies **DATE** 2/29/2012

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Sukhvarsh Jerath , 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 listed in the annual report and are connected to the student learning. The posted assessment plan should be updated to reflect the new goals.

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: It would be very useful to map out how the methods align with your goals so you can ensure that you assess all the goals on a regular basis.

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

Comments: There seems to be no results reported from the assessment. There are, however, some conclusions provided (e.g., more “intensity” is needed in student presentations), which may suggest that data were collected. But examples of data were not included in the report.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

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

Comments: The program is working to update its assessment activities.

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 Space Studies Department has goals and assessment methods in place but there is no indication how these are used. We understand that assessment planning is continuing and a more fully developed process should be in place by next fall.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

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

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	sukhvarsh.jerath@engr.und.edu	joan.hawthorne@email.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 _2010-11_ Annual Reports
UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Space Studies **DATE** 2/16/12

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Joan Hawthorne, Suhkvarsh 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:

Space Studies is designing an assessment program for its minor, and, for a minor, the two clearly-articulated goals seem sufficient.

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.

- 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 departmental goals and alignment of departmental goals with institutional and Essential Studies goals:

No alignment of the program goals with the institutional and ES goals is evident, which is just fine.

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:

It would be very useful to determine exactly how these methods align with the goals identified and to ensure that information is collected in ways that will allow the department to examine program strengths and weaknesses (in addition to overseeing the progress of individual students).

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:

Summary comments suggest that the department may have collected data (e.g., the comment about student presentations) but we did not see any results in the report itself.

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:

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 Space Studies department did not take curricular actions on the basis of results, but did engage in (and continues to complete) a significant amount of assessment planning.

SUMMARY**Strengths**

- _____ A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- X 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.
- X No results are reported.
- X Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
- (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Assessment Committee doesn't typically look specifically at minors (which are normally embedded within majors, and those become the unit of analysis). However, we are pleased to see that you are getting started with assessment planning and implementation while still at the minor stage of your program development. You will be well-positioned for an eventual move to an undergraduate major, should the program develop in that way.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

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

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	<u>joan.hawthorne@und.edu</u>	<u>sukhvarsh.jerath@engr.und.edu</u>	_____

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