Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in <u>2012-2013</u> Annual Reports UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT_Languages	DATEMay 8, 2014							
PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEWChinese								
COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW_Kevin Buettner	, Shari Nelson, Brett Johnson_							
1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS								
 Were any goals referenced? If so, were goals well-articulated? Do goals address student learning? YES_X_ NO_ 	QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N _X QUALIFIED Y/N							
Comments:								
The Languages Department is divided into 4 units – French, German, Spanish, and La (Chinese, Classical Studies, Norwegian, and Russian). These are all undergraduate n in the Languages Department.								
All of these units share common student learning goals, which are notably written at a very general level. According to the assessment plan, "At the culmination of study for a major in one of the languages, students will have met the common three goals: 1. Demonstrate proficiency in the target language. 2. Demonstrate knowledge of literatures in the target language. 3. Demonstrate knowledge of target language culture(s)."								
For each of the three goals, there are associated objectives. These objectives appear to be written to apply to all the units within the Languages Department. According to the plan, "it is up to the faculty in each language unit to agree on which of the objectives for each learning goal best meets the needs of their individual programs of study." Courses are assessed on a three year rotation cycling between the above goals. The student learning goals and objectives appear to be unchanged since the last assessment review done in 2011. We agree with comments made in 2011 by the University Assessment Committee. It likely would be worth considering whether individual language programs could more clearly specify what is meant by the broad departmental goals or objectives within the context of each program. It would be helpful if the assessment plan indicated which objectives have been selected by each program.								
The Chinese program does not have a specific major at UND. The Annual Report for FY13 notes that the faculty for the Chinese department was on leave, so no assessment data was indicated. There were no further goals outside of the departmental goals of assessing "culture" this year.								
In addition to the program goals, please also consider UND's institutional and Essenti (shown in alignment within parentheses) and identify which goals are similar to program within parentheses) and identify which goals are similar to program with a communication – written or oral ("able to write and speak in various settion of the intellectually curious"; Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be intellectually curious"; Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning ("apply empirical data Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluate for effective, efficion with a communication of diversity and use that understan tifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelong learning") Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both for their communities and for the communities and the communities are communities and the communities and the communities and the communities and the communities are	am goals. ngs with a sense of purpose/audience") analyze, synthesize, evaluate) (; explore, discover, engage) analyze graphical information") ent, and ethical use") ding")							

We feel the Language Departments goals clearly address Communication and likely may address Diversity although this is not clear if this would be addressed through the goal, "demonstrate knowledge of target language culture." Objective 3.4 in the department assessment plan states, "critically analyze differences between U.S. culture and target language culture", does appear to address the ES diversity goal. It is not indicated directly if these goals are being assessed within the Chinese program.

There is mention of the China Summer Program, a program put on by both the College of Business and Public Administration and the Chinese Program, celebrating its 12th anniversary. Although not an Essential Studies goal, this seems to align with the Collaboration construct of Exceptional UND.

2.	٨	C	C	T.	7	2	C.	N.	/ T	L	7	N	'n	Γ.	N	/	r	7	T	1		١T	1	C
<i>L</i> .	А	. 7		м	٠,,	٩.	7	IV	1	г	١,	N			ı	1	r.			7	•	,,	J.	•

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

Comments:

The general assessment plan included a methods section, but it was not specific and stated that "methods will vary by course, language, and by individual faculty member." There are specific courses within each program for assessment of intended student learning outcomes. These methods do appear to give faculty members the flexibility to decide what assessment techniques would be best suited for their course. However, it is not clear how that data and any decision-making subsequent to the collected data is shared within the program, or more broadly, the department.

It is not apparent what specific assessment methods were utilized by the Chinese program this year. Previous University Assessment Committee reports indicate quizzes and tests to assess student learning. However, no such method of assessment is referenced in the Annual Report for FY13. This leads to questions on whether assessment was conducted this year by the Chinese program.

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	VEC	NO	OHALIEIED WAL
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:

No data were reported for the Chinese program as a faculty member was on leave.

In addition to program goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. Indicate
any goals for which the program 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 dataanalyze graphical information")
5 Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluatefor 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 program, institutional, and Essential Studies goals: No data or results were reported.								
4. CLOSING T	ГНЕ LOOP							
Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported? • If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?			YES NOX_ Q YES NO Q					
Comments: As no results were reported, it is unclear if any action was taken to address any issues that may have arisen in regards to student learning.								
SUMMARY	SUMMARY Strengths Areas for Improvement							
Student leaAssessmentAssessmentDirect andResults areResults are(Decision- OVERALL States of the second	plan for assessment rning goals are well to methods are clearly to methods are approximated to methods are reported. The tied to closing the logical making is tied to every that the department of the tied to see data in the ties so that the collection is seen to the collection of the ties of t	l-articulated. y described. y described. priately selected. implemented. e implemented. oop. ridence.) RECOMMENDATIO ment is faced with a numbe order to have some additicted data has meaning an s available on the UND U	No specific plan for assessment is in placeStudent learning goals are not well-articulatedXAssessment methods are not clearly describedAssessment methods are not appropriately selectedAssessment methods are not well-implementedA single type of assessment methods predominatesXNo results are reportedResults are not clearly tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)					
X Annual reportX Assessment plan (as posted) Appendices (cited in annual report)X Previous assessment reviewX Other (please describe) Previous annual reports								
Reviewer(s):	Name Department Phone Number e-mail	Kevin Buettner Nursing 777-4509 kevin.buettner@und.edu	Shari Nelson SSC 777-0562 shari.nelson@und.edu	Brett Johnson Student Government 777-4377 brett.johnson.6@my.und.edu				
Section 1:Q_	Section 1:Q Section 2:N Section 3:N Section 4:N							
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 and analyzed in other years)
- Q = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done
- N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA = no information reported and it's unclear whether it was done

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in <u>2012-2013</u> Annual Reports UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

OTTO DENGLISHED THE TWO STREET							
DEPARTMENT Languages DATE May 8, 2014							
PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEWClassical Studies							
COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW_Kevin Buettner, Shari Nelson, Brett Johnson_							
1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS							
 Were any goals referenced? If so, were goals well-articulated? Do goals address student learning? YES_X_ NO_ QUALIFIED Y/N _X_ QUALIFIED Y/N _X_ QUALIFIED Y/N 							
Comments:							
The Languages Department is divided into 4 units – French, German, Spanish, and Less Commonly Taught Languages (Chinese, Classical Studies, Norwegian, and Russian). These are all undergraduate majors. There are no graduate programs in the Languages Department.							
All of these units share common student learning goals, which are notably written at a very general level. According to the assessment plan, "At the culmination of study for a major in one of the languages, students will have met the common three goals: 1. Demonstrate proficiency in the target language. 2. Demonstrate knowledge of literatures in the target language. 3. Demonstrate knowledge of target language culture(s)."							
For each of the three goals, there are associated objectives. These objectives appear to be written to apply to all the units within the Languages Department. According to the plan, "it is up to the faculty in each language unit to agree on which of the objectives for each learning goal best meets the needs of their individual programs of study." Courses are assessed on a three year rotation cycling between the above goals. The student learning goals and objectives appear to be unchanged since the las assessment review done in 2011. We agree with comments made in 2011 by the University Assessment Committee. It likely would be worth considering whether individual language programs could more clearly specify what is meant by the broad departmental goals or objectives within the context of each program. It would be helpful if the assessment plan indicated which objectives have been selected by each program.							
For the Classical Studies major, no goals are outwardly stated. The assessment constantly refers to the incorporation of Greek and Roman culture to the various classes taught within the department, but the exact goal is never stated. This overarching intent of "culture" seems to align with the department's main goal for the year. A few specific courses mention goals for student learning, such as Clas 185 Introduction to Classical Mythology ("ability to offer a cultural interpretation of a specific Greek myth" and "ability to draw connections between ancient myths and contemporary culture").							
In addition to the program 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 program goals. X							

We feel the Language Departments goals clearly address Communication and likely may address Diversity although this is not clear if this would be addressed through the goal, "demonstrate knowledge of target language culture." CLAS 364 Special Topics in Greek and Latin Literature also identifies "ability to find and interpret cultural meaning in a Greek or Latin text, whether literary or material, and to use text as evidence for a cultural question" and "ability to use secondary literature in a mature, scholarly manner," which seems to align with Information Literacy and Thinking and Reasoning-Critical Thinking. As noted above, a few specific programs in the Classical Studies major do have goals that seem to align with Diversity, although it is unclear if these are a part of larger goals for the department.

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	YES	NO_X_	QUALIFIED Y/N
measures" approach?			

Comments:

The general assessment plan included a methods section, but it was not specific and stated that "methods will vary by course, language, and by individual faculty member." There are specific courses within each program for assessment of intended student learning outcomes. These methods do appear to give faculty members the flexibility to decide what assessment techniques would be best suited for their course. However, it is not clear how that data and any decision-making subsequent to the collected data are shared within the program, or more broadly, the department.

The Classical Studies major focused on direct assessment via a pre and post test. Scores were given from 1 to 5, with 5 being the best. These test were based on a few different course goals which related to the overall goal of diversity. Exams were used to assess student learning of the language primarily. It does not appear any indirect assessment was used.

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? Were the results tied to goals for student 	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N _X_
learning?	YES_X_	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N

Comments:

Direct assessment data were reported on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the worst for pre and post tests. For both of the courses that utilized this method, average scores go up practically across the board for the individual course goals. The introductory language courses reported assessment data for the first time as well based on exam scores.

While scores were reported, there was no indication of any action being taken based on the data. A note is made about new courses being introduced into the major, but there is no mention if the assessment data collected here or similar assessment tools will be used (or have been) in creating these courses.

4. CLOSING T	ГНЕ LООР							
Were any action results reported? • If a characteristic character	ns taken on the basis? so, do curricular or anges arising from a	other improvements/ assessment results	YES	NO_X_ NO	QUALIFIED Y/N			
Comments: No class or depo	artmental actions w	ere noted in the annual rep	ort that would	d signal clos	ing the loop.			
SUMMARY	Strengths			Areas j	for Improvement			
AssessmenAssessmenXAssessme	l-articulated. y described. priately selected. l-implemented. are implemented.	No specific plan for assessment is in placeStudent learning goals are not well-articulatedAssessment methods are not clearly describedAssessment methods are not appropriately selectedAssessment methods are not well-implementedA single type of assessment methods predominatesNo results are reportedNo results are not clearly tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)						
OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS: In reviewing the annual report, it appears that the department is faced with a number of different challenges. We feel that while the Languages Department as a whole needs to have some additional conversations about rethinking and improving the assessment process. The Classical Studies major has conducted a good direct assessment, but there is still a need for indirect assessment as well as overall goals for the major. The focus should be on collecting data that has meaning and can be used for discussion, enhancements, and decision-making. Ideally this discussion and decision-making will occur in the respective classes, major, and department. There are several resources available on the UND University Assessment website including the availability of Assessment Consultants if you need assistance during the process of reviewing and revising current assessment plans.								
MATERIALS REVIEWED X Annual report X Assessment plan (as posted) Appendices (cited in annual report) X Previous assessment review								
X Other (please describe) Previous annual reports								
Reviewer(s):	Name Department Phone Number e-mail	Kevin Buettner Nursing 777-4509 kevin.buettner@und.edu	Shari Nels SSC 777-0562 shari.nels		Brett Johnson Student Government 777-4377 brett.johnson.6@my.und.edu			

Section 1: O	Section 2: Y	Section 3: O	Section 4: N

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)

Q = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done

N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning

NA = no information available and it's unclear whether it was done

CIUDENGIA	<u>IDENTILI ROG</u>	TO TO TO					
DEPARTMENT Languages		DATE	April 24, 2014				
PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEWFree	nch						
COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW_Kevin Buettner, Shari Nelson, Brett Johnson_							
1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS							
Were any goals referenced?If so, were goals well-articulated?Do goals address student learning?	YES_X_ YES YES_X_	NO QUA	ALIFIED Y/N ALIFIED Y/N _X ALIFIED Y/N				
Comments:							
The Languages Department is divided into 4 units – Frence (Chinese, Classical Studies, Norwegian, and Russian). The in the Languages Department.							
All of these units share common student learning goals, which are notably written at a very general level. According to the assessment plan, "At the culmination of study for a major in one of the languages, students will have met the common three goals: 1. Demonstrate proficiency in the target language. 2. Demonstrate knowledge of literatures in the target language. 3. Demonstrate knowledge of target language culture(s)." For each of the three goals, there are associated objectives. These objectives appear to be written to apply to all the units within the Languages Department. According to the plan, "it is up to the faculty in each language unit to agree on which of the objectives for each learning goal best meets the needs of their individual programs of study." Courses are assessed on a three year rotation cycling between the above goals. The student learning goals and objectives appear to be unchanged since the last assessment review done in 2011. We agree with comments made in 2011 by the University Assessment Committee. It likely would be worth considering whether individual language programs could more clearly specify what is meant by the broad departmental goals or objectives within the context of each program. It would be helpful if the assessment plan indicated which objectives have been selected by each program. The French major goal of focus for 2012-2013 was knowledge of language culture. Three objectives were identified in the broad Languages Department Assessment plan and it is assumed that these objectives were utilized by the French major, although this is not clear in the Annual Report.							
In addition to the program goals, please also consider UN: (shown in alignment within parentheses) and identify white	ch goals are similar ite and speak in variate and speak in variate and speak in variate in the intellectually of the intellectually of the intellectually of the intellectually of the intellectual intellectual in the intellectual intellectu	to program goals ious settings with purious"; analyze, creative"; explore al dataanalyze g ve, efficient, and onderstanding")	a sense of purpose/audience") synthesize, evaluate) e, discover, engage) graphical information") ethical use")				

We feel the Language Departments goals address Communication and likely may address Diversity although this is not clear if this would be addressed through the goal, "demonstrate knowledge of target language culture." Objective 3.4 in the department assessment plan states, "critically analyze differences between U.S. culture and target language culture", does appear to address the ES diversity goal. However, because there are general goals and objectives in the assessment plan, it is unclear if it applies specifically to the French major.

2.	Λ	C	C	H	(16	1	1	T	וה	V	Т	N	n	R٢	ľ	H	ìT	1	C

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	YES	NO_X_	QUALIFIED Y/N
measures" approach?			

Comments:

The general assessment plan included a methods section, but it was not specific and stated that "methods will vary by course, language, and by individual faculty member." There are specific courses within each program for assessment of intended student learning outcomes. These methods do appear to give faculty members the flexibility to decide what assessment techniques would be best suited for their course.

For French, data were collected from a student assignment (paper) in a single course (French 307) during the Fall 2012 semester. The assignment sought to determine how well the students were able to define and treat a topic from their texts. Data were presented from the work of 13 students in four areas (define issue, issue expression, examples of analysis, and conclusions from the analysis). The assessment plan specifies four classes that data would be collected for the cultural goal, however it appears that the actual assessment focuses on scores on one assignment from a single class. Several useful changes were suggested previously in the 2011 review, which might make future assessments more useful:

- Structure test questions or grading processes in such a way that they will produce information that relates specifically to an individual outcome.
- If at all possible, collect work samples from across three or four of the target classes (perhaps during different semesters) and plan an assessment discussion that might include time for re-reading student work samples (consider those from classes other than own). Analyzing across multiple courses will make findings feel more relevant to the program rather than primarily to an individual teacher and course.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES_X_	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
, i	YES	NO_X_	QUALIFIED Y/N
 If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? Were the results tied to goals for student 	YES	NO_X_	QUALIFIED Y/N
learning?	YES	NO_X_	QUALIFIED Y/N

Comments:

Data were collected from a student assignment within one course where the focus of the course was on culture. It should be noted that students in the French 307 course had also taken French 305. However, there was no data collected from French 305. It was not clear if the intent was to assess student learning from French 305 through the paper in French 307. There was no clear analysis or interpretation of the results and how it related to the goals on the assessment plan. It is not clear how that data and any decision-making subsequent to the collected data are shared within the program, or more broadly, the department.

In addition to program goals, some assessment results may be any goals for which the program presents findings, and, for it is a communication – written or oral ("able to write 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "least Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning 5 Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluated by the communication of diversity ("demonstrate understanding of diversity 1 Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelor 1 Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both for 1 communication of the com	ndicated iten and speak in e intellectual be intellectual ("apply emp uatefor eff ity and use th ng learning")	ns, describe fir various setting ly curious"; ar ally creative"; a irical dataar ective, efficier at understandi	ndings below. gs with a sense of purpose/audience") nalyze, synthesize, evaluate) explore, discover, engage) nalyze graphical information") nt, and ethical use") ng")				
Comments regarding results and the application of results The goal of focus this year did not clearly align with ES.	to program, i	institutional, a	and Essential Studies goals:				
4. CLOSING THE LOOP							
Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported? • If so, do curricular or other improvements/	YES	NO_X_	_ QUALIFIED Y/N				
changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N				
Comments: No class or departmental actions were noted in the annual restrategies appear to be the same as those noted during the accommittee.							
SUMMARY Strengths		Areas	for Improvement				
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.)	No specific plan for assessment is in placeStudent learning goals are not well-articulatedAssessment methods are not clearly describedAssessment methods are not appropriately selectedXAssessment methods are not well-implementedXA single type of assessment methods predominatesNo results are reportedXResults are not clearly tied to closing the loop(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)						
OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION	ONS:						
In reviewing the annual report, it appears that the department encourage the department to have some additional conversa that the collected data has meaning and can be used for discresources available on the UND University Assessment websineed assistance.	tions about r cussion, enha	ethinking and ncements, and	improving the assessment process so decision-making. There are several				
MATERIALS REVIEWED							
 X Annual report Appendices (cited in annual report) X Other (please describe) Previous annual reports 		sessment plan (vious assessme					

Reviewer(s):	Name	Kevin Buettner	Shari Nelson	Brett Johnson					
	Department	Nursing	SSC	Student Government					
	Phone Number	777-4509	777-0562	777-4377					
	e-mail	kevin.buettner@und.edu	shari.nelson@und.edu	brett.johnson.6@my.und.edu					
Section 1:	Q Section 2:	Q Section 3:Q	Section 4:N						
Coding Key:									
Y	•			ram(s) reviewed and recognizing collected and analyzed in other					
Q	= qualified yes as a appropriately done	action or progress is apparent	; however, evidence is lacki	ng that this is completely and					
N	= no, this is not do	ne at all, or it is not done in re	elationship to student learni	ng					
NA									

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in ______ 2012-2013 ____ Annual Reports UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

<u>UNDERGRA</u>	DUATE PRO	<u>GRAMS</u>		
DEPARTMENT_Languages_		DAT	TE May 8 th ,	2014
PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEWGerr	man Studies Pi	rogram		
COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING RE	EVIEW_ <u>Kevin</u>	Buettner, Sh	ari Nelson, Br	ett Johnson_
1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS				
Were any goals referenced?If so, were goals well-articulated?Do goals address student learning?	YES_X_ YES YES_X_	NO	QUALIFIED Y/I QUALIFIED Y/I QUALIFIED Y/I	NX
Comments:				
The Languages Department is divided into 4 units – Frenc (Chinese, Classical Studies, Norwegian, and Russian). The in the Languages Department.				
All of these units share common student learning goals, whassessment plan, "At the culmination of study for a major goals: 1. Demonstrate proficiency in the target language 2. Demonstrate knowledge of literatures in the target language cultivation."	in one of the lang e. rget language.			
For each of the three goals, there are associated objective within the Languages Department. According to the plan, objectives for each learning goal best meets the needs of the year rotation cycling between the above goals. The studen assessment review done in 2011. We agree with comments would be worth considering whether individual language placemental goals or objectives within the context of each objectives have been selected by each program.	"it is up to the fa heir individual pi t learning goals o made in 2011 by programs could i	aculty in each lo rograms of stud and objectives o the University nore clearly sp	anguage unit to a ly." Courses are appear to be uncl Assessment Con ecify what is mea	gree on which of the assessed on a three hanged since the las nmittee. It likely unt by the broad
For the German major specifically, it appears the focus we curriculum underwent a completely revised curriculum in section on the German Studies Program in the Annual Repcurriculum rather than focusing on assessment methods of to share at this time. The German Studies Program should ensure that representative courses are listed for the rotation	2012-2013 and to port was focused result presenting result make sure it upo	hey are now the on providing an lts, of which the lates the Langu	e German Studies n overview of the e program stated uages Departmen	s Program. The changes within the they had no results t Assessment Plan to
In addition to the program goals, please also consider UNI (shown in alignment within parentheses) and identify whice X 1 Communication – written or oral ("able to write 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or 4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning 5 Information literacy ("be able to access and ev X 6 Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of dive 7 Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifel 8 Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both	ch goals are simile te and speak in veribe intellectually "be intellectually "be intellectually ing ("apply empiraluatefor effective insity and use that long learning")	lar to program garious settings various"; analy y creative"; expical dataanalytive, efficient, at understanding	goals. with a sense of puyze, synthesize, eplore, discover, enyze graphical infoand ethical use")")	urpose/audience") evaluate) ngage) ormation")

We feel the Language Departments goals clearly address Communication and likely may address Diversity although this is not clear if this would be addressed through the goal, "demonstrate knowledge of target language culture." Objective 3.4 in the department assessment plan states, "critically analyze differences between U.S. culture and target language culture", does appear to address the ES diversity goal. However, because the goals and objectives in the Language Departments assessment plan are general, it is unclear if it applies specifically to the German Studies Program.

2.	Λ	C	C	F	C	C	N.	1	Н	'n	JT	ן י	M	T	٦r	ľ	1	ıT	1	C

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

Comments:

The general assessment plan included a methods section, but it was not specific and stated that "methods will vary by course, language, and by individual faculty member." There are specific courses within each program for assessment of intended student learning outcomes. These methods do appear to give faculty members the flexibility to decide what assessment techniques would be best suited for their course. However, it is not clear how that data and any decision-making subsequent to the collected data are shared within the program, or more broadly, the department.

Specifically in the German Studies program, data was collected utilizing an end of semester survey (Spring 2013) in First Year German, although it is unclear what was being assessed. In Second Year German, assessment data was obtained from student USAT's, informal feedback, and course test scores. In Third Year German, assessment data was obtained from course exams and writing assignments. In Fourth Year German, a survey was administered that asked students to reflect on "the cultural material presented in the class." However, it is unclear when that survey was administered – we assumed it was the end of the semester.

In the future, ideally the methods will be aligned with individual learning goals for the program and will include a combination of direct and indirect assessment techniques across different courses and semesters. Analyzing across multiple courses will make findings feel more relevant to the program rather than primarily to an individual teacher and course.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/NX_
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals?	YES	NO_X_	QUALIFIED Y/N
 If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? 	YES	NO_X_	QUALIFIED Y/N
 Were the results tied to goals for student learning? 	YES	NO_X_	QUALIFIED Y/N

Comments:

<u>First Year German</u>: Data were collected in First Year German utilizing an end of semester student survey administered in the Spring 2013 semester. The results were described as "overwhelmingly positive." However, no other specific data was provided.

<u>Second Year German</u>: Data were collected from student USAT's, informal feedback, and course test scores. USAT scores were described as "consistently positive" and informal feedback was described as "positive." Course test scores were described as being "on the decline." The faculty member did note that they planned on trying to determine a reason for the decline in test scores utilizing informal surveys that "ask students to reflect on their learning process."

<u>Third Year German</u>: It appears that data were collected from exams and writing assignments (essay) in German 307 and those results show that "students are being challenged to engage and think critically about topics..." However, no other specific data was provided.

<u>Fourth Year German</u>: Data were collected from a survey given during German 406 that "demonstrate that students both recognize and have retained a significant amount of cultural knowledge from this course." However, no other specific data was provided.

Overall, there were assessment results provided, but we feel they did not clearly illustrate achievement of goals, areas of improvement, and/or if the results were tied to goals for student learning.

any goals for which the program presents findings, and, for i1 Communication – written or oral ("able to write2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "b3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "l	and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience") e intellectually curious"; analyze, synthesize, evaluate) be intellectually creative"; explore, discover, engage) ("apply empirical dataanalyze graphical information") uatefor effective, efficient, and ethical use") ity and use that understanding") ing learning")
Comments regarding results and the application of results at The goal of focus this year did not clearly align with ES.	to program, institutional, and Essential Studies goals:
4. CLOSING THE LOOP	
Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported? • If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	YES NO QUALIFIED Y/NX_ YES NOX_ QUALIFIED Y/N
Comments:	
stated "in reaction to student comments, we have revised this. In the future, it would be great if more examples could be pro	aken on the basis of assessment result. In First Year German, they is program slightly and increased cultural readings and activities ovided that clearly show closing the loop.
SUMMARY Strengths	Areas for Improvement
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. X_Direct and indirect methods are implemented. Results are reported. Results are tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is tied to evidence.)	No specific plan for assessment is in placeX Student learning goals are not well-articulatedX_ Assessment methods are not clearly described Assessment methods are not appropriately selectedX_ Assessment methods are not well-implementedX_ A single type of assessment methods predominates No results are reportedX_ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

We applaud you for revising your entire curriculum for the German Studies Program and appreciate the overview given in the FY 2013 Annual Report. We understand that there was a lack of assessment data due to the curriculum transition. We look forward to seeing future assessment data based on these changes.

In reviewing the annual report, it appears that the department is faced with a number of different challenges. We feel the Languages Department as a whole needs to have some additional conversations about rethinking and improving the assessment process. The focus should be on collecting data that has meaning and can be used for discussion, enhancements, and decision-making. Ideally this discussion and decision-making will occur in all of the following: the respective classes, major, and department. There are several resources available on the UND University Assessment website including the availability of Assessment Consultants if you need assistance during the process of reviewing and revising current assessment plans.

MATERIALS	S REVIEWED			
	report lices (cited in annual please describe)		_X_ Assessment plan (as Previous assessment	
Reviewer(s):	Name Department Phone Number e-mail	Kevin Buettner Nursing 777-4509 kevin.buettner@und.edu	Shari Nelson SSC 777-0562 shari.nelson@und.edu	Brett Johnson Student Government 777-4377 brett.johnson.6@my.und.edu
Section 1:Y	Z Section 2:	Q Section 3:Q	Section 4:Q	
Coding Key: Y Q N NA	that assessment is a = qualified yes as a appropriately done = no, this is not don	cyclical process, i.e., with ac	Iditional kinds of data to be; however, evidence is lacking elationship to student learning	ing that this is completely and

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in <u>2012-2013</u> Annual Reports <u>UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS</u>

DEPARTMENT <u>Languages</u>	DATE <u>April 24, 2014</u>
PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW	Norwegian
COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTIN	IG REVIEW_ <u>Kevin Buettner, Shari Nelson, Brett Johnson</u>
1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS	
Were any goals referenced?If so, were goals well-articulated?Do goals address student learning?	YES_X_ NO QUALIFIED Y/N YES NO QUALIFIED Y/N _X YES_X_ NO QUALIFIED Y/N
Comments:	
	French, German, Spanish, and Less Commonly Taught Languages an). These are all undergraduate majors. There are no graduate programs
	the target language.
within the Languages Department. According to the objectives for each learning goal best meets the need year rotation cycling between the above goals. The sassessment review done in 2011. We agree with commould be worth considering whether individual lang departmental goals or objectives within the context objectives have been selected by each program. For the Norwegian major, the focus for 2012 – 2013	eplan, "it is up to the faculty in each language unit to agree on which of the eds of their individual programs of study." Courses are assessed on a three student learning goals and objectives appear to be unchanged since the last nments made in 2011 by the University Assessment Committee. It likely guage programs could more clearly specify what is meant by the broad of each program. It would be helpful if the assessment plan indicated which 3 was to demonstrate knowledge of literatures in the target language. The nguages Department Assessment plan were clearly utilized by the
Norwegian major in the Annual Report.	iguages Department Assessment plan were clearly utilized by the
(shown in alignment within parentheses) and identif X 1 Communication – written or oral ("able 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinkin 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinkin 4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative re 5 Information literacy ("be able to access a X 6 Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of the communication of the com	to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience") ng (or "be intellectually curious"; analyze, synthesize, evaluate) ing (or "be intellectually creative"; explore, discover, engage) easoning ("apply empirical dataanalyze graphical information") and evaluatefor effective, efficient, and ethical use") of diversity and use that understanding")

We feel the Language Departments goals address Communication and likely may address Diversity although this is not clear if this would be addressed through the goal, "demonstrate knowledge of target language culture."

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	YES_X_	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
measures" approach?			-

Comments:

The general assessment plan included a methods section, but it was not specific and stated that "methods will vary by course, language, and by individual faculty member." There are specific courses within each program for assessment of intended student learning outcomes. These methods do appear to give faculty members the flexibility to decide what assessment techniques would be best suited for their course.

For the Norwegian major specifically, we found that both direct and indirect assessment methods were utilized across different courses (NORW 403, NORW 433, and NORW 434) and across multiple semesters. Direct assessment data came primarily from final exam essays and a journal entry, reaction paper. It was clear to the reader in the Annual Report which data was being used to support the stated objective. For example, for Objective 2.1 (Critically read and interpret a variety of literary texts in the target language), there is a table that lists the tasks (final exam essay, reaction paper) and associated data from different classes (NORW 403, NORW 433) across different semesters. Indirect assessment data came from USAT questionnaires. There was data listed for objective 2.1 and 2.2, but not 2.3. Supplementing the direct assessment method with an indirect assessment method can assist to either confirm or disconfirm findings. The ES portion of the USATs may provide additional valuable information regarding student learning. Faculty within the Norwegian major may want to stress the importance of filling out this section to students.

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? Were the results tied to goals for student 	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N _X_
learning?	YES_X_	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N

Comments:

Direct assessment data were reported from a scoring rubric with four categories: Excellent, Good, Moderate, and Minimal. These scores came from final exam essays and a reaction paper from multiple courses across different semesters. These are all certainly elements of good assessment practices. Likewise, data from the USAT student evaluations from multiple courses across different semesters were shown to support the different objectives. It is not clear that this data specifically affirms achievement of goals and/or if they indicate need for improvement. Additionally, it is not clear how that data and any decision-making subsequent to the collected data are shared within the program, or more broadly, the department.

any goals for which the program presents findings, and, for 1 Communication – written or oral ("able to write 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or " 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or " 4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning 5 Information literacy ("be able to access and eva 6 Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of divers 7 Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelo 8 Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both for	e and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience") be intellectually curious"; analyze, synthesize, evaluate) "be intellectually creative"; explore, discover, engage) g ("apply empirical dataanalyze graphical information") luatefor effective, efficient, and ethical use") sity and use that understanding") ong learning") for their communities and for the world")
Comments regarding results and the application of results The goal of focus this year did not clearly align with ES.	to program, institutional, and Essential Studies goals:
4. CLOSING THE LOOP	
Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported? • If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results	YES NO_X_ QUALIFIED Y/N
directly address goals for student learning?	YES NO QUALIFIED Y/N
Comments: No class or departmental actions were noted in the annual	report that would signal closing the loop.
SUMMARY Strengths	Areas for Improvement
A specific plan for assessment is in place Student learning goals are well-articulated X_ Assessment methods are clearly described Assessment methods are appropriately selected X_ Assessment methods are well-implemented X_ Direct and indirect methods are implemented Results are reported Results are tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is tied to evidence.)	 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. X Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)
OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATE	IONS:
while the Languages Department as a whole needs to have assessment process, the Norwegian major is definitely on the meaning and can be used for discussion, enhancements, and occur in the respective classes, major, and department. The	ent is faced with a number of different challenges. We feel that some additional conversations about rethinking and improving the teright path. The focus should be on collecting data that has addecision-making. Ideally this discussion and decision-making will be are several resources available on the UND University to the terms of the terms
MATERIALS REVIEWED	
 X Annual report Appendices (cited in annual report) X Other (please describe) Previous annual reports 	X Assessment plan (as posted) X Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	Kevin Buettner	Shari Nelson	Brett Johnson
	Department	Nursing	SSC	Student Government
	Phone Number	777-4509	777-0562	777-4377
	e-mail	kevin.buettner@und.edu	shari.nelson@und.edu	brett.johnson.6@my.und.edu
 Section 1:Q		Y Section 3:Q	Section 4:N	
Coding Key:				
Y		appropriately and well (bearing cyclical process, i.e., with ad-		ram(s) reviewed and recognizing collected in other years)
Q	= qualified yes as a appropriately done	ection or progress is apparent	however, evidence is lacki	ng that this is completely and
N	= no, this is not do	ne at all, or it is not done in re	elationship to student learni	ng
NA	= no information a	vailable and it's unclear whet	her it was done	

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in _____ 2012-2013 ____ Annual Reports UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT_Languages	DATE <u>May 8, 2014</u>
PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Spanish	
COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW_Kevin B	uettner, Shari Nelson, Brett Johnson
1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS	
 Were any goals referenced? If so, were goals well-articulated? Do goals address student learning? YESX_ 	NO QUALIFIED Y/N NO QUALIFIED Y/N _X_ NO QUALIFIED Y/N
Comments:	
The Languages Department is divided into 4 units – French, German, Spanis (Chinese, Classical Studies, Norwegian, and Russian). These are all undergrin the Languages Department.	
All of these units share common student learning goals, which are notably we assessment plan, "At the culmination of study for a major in one of the langu goals: 1. Demonstrate proficiency in the target language. 2. Demonstrate knowledge of literatures in the target language. 3. Demonstrate knowledge of target language culture(s)."	
For each of the three goals, there are associated objectives. These objectives within the Languages Department. According to the plan, "it is up to the fact objectives for each learning goal best meets the needs of their individual progrear rotation cycling between the above goals. The student learning goals an assessment review done in 2011. We agree with comments made in 2011 by twould be worth considering whether individual language programs could madepartmental goals or objectives within the context of each program. It would objectives have been selected by each program.	ulty in each language unit to agree on which of the grams of study." Courses are assessed on a three d objectives appear to be unchanged since the last the University Assessment Committee. It likely ore clearly specify what is meant by the broad
The Spanish major focused on the cultural part of the assessment. It is also u specifically under "culture."	nclear if the Spanish major had any other goals
In addition to the program goals, please also consider UND's institutional and (shown in alignment within parentheses) and identify which goals are similar X 1 Communication – written or oral ("able to write and speak in variance 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be intellectually of 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be intellectually 4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning ("apply empirica 5 Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluatefor effection X 6 Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that upon the community of the	to program goals. ious settings with a sense of purpose/audience") urious"; analyze, synthesize, evaluate) creative"; explore, discover, engage) al dataanalyze graphical information") ve, efficient, and ethical use") understanding")

Comments regarding program goals and alignment with institutional and Essential Studies goals:

We feel the Language Departments goals clearly address Corclear if this would be addressed through the goal, "demonstrated and the search of t			
2. ASSESSMENT METHODS			
 Were any specific assessment methods referenced? If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual 	YES_X_	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N

YES_X__ NO___

YES____ NO_X_ QUALIFIED Y/N ____

QUALIFIED Y/N ____

Comments:

The general assessment plan included a methods section, but it was not specific and stated that "methods will vary by course, language, and by individual faculty member." There are specific courses within each program for assessment of intended student learning outcomes. These methods do appear to give faculty members the flexibility to decide what assessment techniques would be best suited for their course. However, it is not clear how that data and any decision-making subsequent to the collected data are shared within the program, or more broadly, the department.

For the Spanish major, the only assessment was noted through one class, Spanish 311 Spanish American Civilization and Culture. The only method noted is direct assessment through a pre and post test on subject material. This appears to be the only tool utilized. It is unclear if there are other goals within the Spanish major, even in regards to diversity.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

goals?

measures" approach?

Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple

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/NX_
If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? When the second is a second 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/NX_

Comments:

Direct assessment data was reported utilizing basic percentage comparisons on various categories within the Spanish 311 course. These categories include pre-Colombian civilization, geography, historical periods, and cultural information. The second and third categories witnessed small increases from pre to post test, specifically a 14.9% and 4.7% increase. The other categories were closer to 40% between the two tests.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any act	tions taken on the basis of assessment			
results report	ted?	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:

Comments are made about unsatisfactory results for the geography and historical periods portion of the assessment. Although these deficiencies are apparent and noted, the only conclusions are "students are simply uninterested in learning" and to "applaud [the professor's] own efforts and accomplishments." This appears to be a discrepancy between the data and actions taken based on opinions of why students are not achieving desired results. While it is clear students are not reaching appropriate levels of comprehension for the course, everything is being left as is.

SUMMARY Strengths Areas for Improvement A specific plan for assessment is in place. No specific plan for assessment is in place. ____Student learning goals are well-articulated. ____ Student learning goals are not well-articulated. __Assessment methods are clearly described. Assessment methods are not clearly described. _Assessment methods are appropriately selected. __ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected. _Assessment methods are well-implemented. __ Assessment methods are not well-implemented. X_ A single type of assessment methods predominates. _Direct and indirect methods are implemented. Results are reported. No results are reported. _Results are tied to closing the loop. _X__ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is tied to evidence.) (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.) **OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:** In reviewing the annual report, it appears that the department is faced with a number of different challenges. We feel that while the Languages Department as a whole needs to have some additional conversations about rethinking and improving the assessment process. The focus should be on collecting data that has meaning and can be used for discussion, enhancements, and decision-making, Ideally this discussion and decision-making will occur in the respective classes, major, and department. There are several resources available on the UND University Assessment website including the availability of Assessment Consultants if you need assistance during the process of reviewing and revising current assessment plans. As well, it appears that within the Spanish major, specifically in regards to "culture" as indicated in the Annual Report for FY13, an indirect assessment may go a long way in addressing why students are not retaining comprehension in key areas. Such an assessment could highlight the true reason why students underperformed and allow for better planning in the courses future. MATERIALS REVIEWED _X _ Annual report X _ Assessment plan (as posted) Appendices (cited in annual report) X Previous assessment review X Other (please describe) Previous annual reports Reviewer(s): Name Shari Nelson Kevin Buettner Brett Johnson Department Student Government Nursing Phone Number 777-4509 777-4377 brett.johnson.6@my.und.edu kevin.buettner@und.edu shari.nelson@und.edu e-mail Section 1: __Q___ Section 2: __Y___ Section 3: __Q___ Section 4: __N___ Coding Key: = 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) Q = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning NA = no information available and it's unclear whether it was done