

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2011-12 Annual Reports
UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Nutrition and Dietetics **DATE** 3/24/13

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW B.S. in Community Nutrition

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Mary K. Askim-Lovseth and Deborah Worley

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

Comments:

The Department of Nutrition and Dietetics has two undergraduate programs, a B.S. in Community and a B.S. in Dietetics. There is a 2013-14 Departmental Plan for Assessment of Student Learning posted on the University website for the Community Nutrition Program, but a 2011-12 Assessment Plan was acquired for this review (received from Dr. Jan Goodwin, Department Chair) to coincide with the Annual Report.

According to the Assessment Plan, the Community Nutrition Program had eight goals that relate to student learning (seven goals were noted in the Annual Report). "Demonstrate active participation, teamwork, and contributions in group settings" was not included in the listing provided in the Annual Report. As a result of a recommendation from the last review, the Department developed objectives for the student learning goals to denote distinct outcomes. Though the goals are well articulated, some of the objectives address multiple skills and concepts; for example, "Demonstrates professional attributes within various organizational cultures, including but not limited to time management, priority setting, critical thinking, decision making, leadership, and collaboration."

Since some of the outcomes are multidimensional, it becomes more difficult to determine if an objective is achieved. It would be best if the outcomes were distinct in order to align learning with expectations.

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)
- 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")
- X 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 departmental goals and alignment of departmental goals with institutional and Essential Studies goals:

Several of the student learning goals correlated to the Institutional and Essential Studies goals though the language may not be explicit. Relating to diversity for example, the objective is "Apply understanding of the influence of socioeconomic, cultural, social, psychological, and ethnic food consumption issues and trends to nutrition practice."

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__X__ NO___ QUALIFIED Y/N ___

- Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach?

YES__X__ NO___ QUALIFIED Y/N ___

Comments:

Multiple direct and indirect measures were noted in the Assessment Plan and both types of measures were used in assessing student learning during 2011-12. Direct measures included a comprehensive exam, nutrition controversy paper, assessment project and its program plan, nutrition articles for the public, and preceptor evaluations; self-evaluations were noted as the indirect measure. Each measure was aligned with a specific learning goal; and in some instances, one measure was used to assess more than one goal.

Several of the benchmarks identified in the Assessment Plan are related to a percentage of the students receiving a B or better grade on the artifact/measure. Grades should not be used to assess student achievement of a learning outcome as they do not provide specific information where improvements can be made concerning the criteria. Rubrics are helpful in this regard and it appears there are some rubrics developed for certain measures as there was the reference to a percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations.

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?
- If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?
- Were the results tied to goals for student learning?

YES__X__ NO___ QUALIFIED Y/N ___

YES__X__ NO___ QUALIFIED Y/N ___

YES__X__ NO___ QUALIFIED Y/N ___

Comments:

Data were provided for written communication (“at least 80% of students meeting/exceeding writing standards”) and that “all majors demonstrated ability...” to develop nutrition interventions based on community needs assessment. Content weaknesses were also reported based on the final comprehensive exam results.

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. .

 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)

 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:

See previous commentary.

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 ☐ QUALIFIED Y/N ☐

Comments:

Prior assessment data in 2010-11 indicated emphasis needed to be placed on communication and thinking and reasoning. More writing assignments, case studies, and peer evaluations of writing were incorporated into selected classes to help improve these skills. It was noted that improvement has been shown. Regarding the content weaknesses, further analysis indicated students opting for a lower level Chemistry course had lower content competency levels. No action was proposed.

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:

A revised Community Nutrition Assessment Plan has been submitted for 2013-14 which addresses more specificity regarding the level of student achievement with use of the rubrics. A suggestion would be to address singular competencies for objectives. Currently some of the goals could have objectives written which would make it easier to align the measure, data, and objective. Two of these goals include "Communicate effectively, both orally and in writing" and "Demonstrate professional attributes including time management, priority setting, work ethic, critical thinking, advocacy, and service to professional and community organizations. At least six objectives are embedded in this goal. Appropriate measures would then be developed for each.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

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

E-mail communication with Dr. Jan Goodwin, Department Chair, on March , 2013, to secure a 2011-12 Assessment Plan.

Reviewer(s):	Name	Mary K. Askim-Lovseth	Deborah Worley
	Department	Marketing	Educational Leadership
	Phone Number	777-2930	777-3140
	e-mail	maskim@business.und.edu	deborah.worley@und.edu

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

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected in other years)
 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