

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2011-2012 Annual Reports
GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT_ Counseling Psychology and Community Services _____ DATE_3.1.2013_____

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW _Counseling MA Program_____

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW_ Sukhvarsh Jerath, Joan Hawthorne_____

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|------|------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES__X__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N __ |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES__X__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N __ |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES__X__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N __ |

Comments: Goals for the master's program are stated in language that includes the verb (i.e., names what students will do). It appears that goal language for this program as for others in the department is intended to align with accreditor expectations.

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: The alignment between goals and exam sub scores is very clear. For other assessments, the alignment is less explicit but can still be followed.

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__X__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N __ |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? | YES__X__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N __ |
| • Were the results tied to goals for student learning? | YES__X__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N __ |

Comments: Results are linked to eight foundational areas which in turn link to learning outcomes.

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__X__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N __ |

Comments: Concrete changes (e.g. adding a new course, changing course sequencing) were described as resulting from findings regarding areas of strength and weakness.

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:

We note different emphasis areas and both distance and on-campus programs. It is good to see that you are collecting data from both the distance and on-campus students. Once you have sufficient information, it might be useful to see if there are differences in outcomes across emphasis areas since the curricula are somewhat different.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe) - Course Catalog | |

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

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

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

Revision 10/11/12

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in _2011-12_ Annual Reports
GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT __Counseling Psychology and Community Services__ **DATE** __3-1-2013__

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW __Counseling Psychology Ph.D. Program__

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW __Sukhvarsh Jerath, Joan Hawthorne__

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__X__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N __ |

Comments: Instead of articulating learning outcomes, the plan describes competency clusters that are drawn from their accreditor. It might be helpful to update those into learning outcomes for greater clarity. Perhaps the current plan is intended to build on outcomes in the 2005 plan, but that is not clear.

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: The Observed Structural Clinical Examination (OSCE) is a direct measure used in 2011-12. Indirect measures are in the plan but are not implemented every year.

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__X__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N __ |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? | YES__X__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N __ |
| • Were the results tied to goals for student learning? | YES__X__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N __ |

Comments: Both data and conclusions, including identifying areas of need, were described in the annual report.

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__X__ | NO__ | QUALIFIED Y/N __ |

Comments: Objectives in core courses were revised to align with needed competencies, and instructors are now focusing learning activities on those objectives.

