

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

DEPARTMENT Pathology DATE 3-5-13

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Cytotechnology

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 goals identified in the annual report do not match those in the posted plan (although both sets of goals are well-articulated). Please check the plan that's posted and update if necessary.

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”)
 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...”)
 X 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 goals indicated above are included in the list of goals found in the annual report.

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 number of methods, including both direct and indirect measures, are used annually (surveys, Board scores, sensitivity scores, etc.).

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
• Were the results tied to goals for student learning?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

In addition to providing examples of results, the report links results back to specific goals. It's helpful, as an outside reader, to have that linkage traced since the alignment would not always be intuitively evident.

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:

No results regarding the institutional and ES goals were reported.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
• If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

The loop-closing changes described are connected to a content area (respiratory system), which seems likely to be covered in the competency goals although the linkage is not clear to an outside reader.

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 differences between the annual report and the assessment plan make this somewhat difficult to follow. But we are very pleased to see you collecting information and making decisions, based on that information, designed to improve learning. Please ensure that the plan is current when the next annual report is submitted.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

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

☒ Assessment plan (as posted)
☒ Previous assessment review

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

Section 1: ☒ Y ☐ N Section 2: ☒ Y ☐ N Section 3: ☒ Y ☐ N Section 4: ☐ ? ☐ NA

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