

**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**  
**Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-2013 Annual Reports**  
**UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

**DEPARTMENT** Languages **DATE** May 8, 2014

**PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW** Chinese

**COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW** Kevin Buettner, Shari Nelson, Brett Johnson

**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 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 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 Essential Studies goals for student learning (shown in alignment within parentheses) and identify which goals are similar to program goals.

- |            |   |  |
|------------|---|--|
| <u>X</u>   | 1 | Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”) |
| <u>   </u> | 2 | Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)       |
| <u>   </u> | 3 | Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage)          |
| <u>   </u> | 4 | Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”)         |
| <u>   </u> | 5 | Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”)              |
| <u>X</u>   | 6 | Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”)                               |
| <u>   </u> | 7 | Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)   |
| <u>   </u> | 8 | Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)                        |

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

*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 12<sup>th</sup> anniversary. Although not an Essential Studies goal, this seems to align with the Collaboration construct of Exceptional UND.*

## 2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

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 measures” approach?	YES_____	NO_____	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 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 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 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 program, institutional, and Essential Studies goals:**  
*No data or results were reported.*

#### 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:**

*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

##### *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.
- X \_\_\_\_\_ 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.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.  
(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

#### OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

*Overall, it appears that the department is faced with a number of different challenges. Specifically within the Chinese program, it would be beneficial to see data in order to have some additional conversations about rethinking and improving the assessment process so that the collected data has meaning and can be used for discussion, enhancements, and decision-making. There are several resources available on the UND University Assessment website including the availability of Assessment Consultants if you need assistance.*

#### 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	<u>Kevin Buettner</u>	<u>Shari Nelson</u>	<u>Brett Johnson</u>
	Department	<u>Nursing</u>	<u>SSC</u>	<u>Student Government</u>
	Phone Number	<u>777-4509</u>	<u>777-0562</u>	<u>777-4377</u>
	e-mail	<u>kevin.buettner@und.edu</u>	<u>shari.nelson@und.edu</u>	<u>brett.johnson.6@my.und.edu</u>

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

*Revision 9/25/13*

**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**  
**Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-2013 Annual Reports**  
**UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

**DEPARTMENT** Languages **DATE** May 8, 2014

**PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW** Classical Studies

**COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW** Kevin Buettner, Shari Nelson, Brett Johnson

**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 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 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.*

*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.

- |               |  |
|---------------|--|
| <u>  X  </u>  | 1 Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”) |
| <u>  X  </u>  | 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)       |
| <u>      </u> | 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage)          |
| <u>      </u> | 4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”)         |
| <u>  X  </u>  | 5 Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”)              |
| <u>  X  </u>  | 6 Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”)                               |
| <u>      </u> | 7 Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)   |
| <u>      </u> | 8 Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)                        |

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

*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 measures” approach?	YES____	NO__X__	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.*

*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?	YES____	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N __X__
• Were the results tied to goals for student 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 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:**

*No class or departmental actions were noted in the annual report that would signal closing the loop.*

#### 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.
- X Assessment methods are well-implemented.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
- X 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.
- X 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
- \_\_\_\_\_ Appendices (cited in annual report)
- X Other (please describe)  
*Previous annual reports*

- X Assessment plan (as posted)
- X Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	<u>Kevin Buettner</u>	<u>Shari Nelson</u>	<u>Brett Johnson</u>
	Department	<u>Nursing</u>	<u>SSC</u>	<u>Student Government</u>
	Phone Number	<u>777-4509</u>	<u>777-0562</u>	<u>777-4377</u>
	e-mail	<u>kevin.buettner@und.edu</u>	<u>shari.nelson@und.edu</u>	<u>brett.johnson.6@my.und.edu</u>

-----

Section 1: \_\_Q\_\_    Section 2: \_\_Y\_\_    Section 3: \_\_Q\_\_    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

*Revision 9/25/13*



**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**  
**Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-2013 Annual Reports**  
**UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

**DEPARTMENT** Languages **DATE** April 24, 2014

**PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW** French

**COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW** Kevin Buettner, Shari Nelson, Brett Johnson

**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 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 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 UND’s institutional and Essential Studies goals for student learning (shown in alignment within parentheses) and identify which goals are similar to program goals.

- |            |   |  |
|------------|---|--|
| <u>X</u>   | 1 | Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”) |
| <u>   </u> | 2 | Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)       |
| <u>   </u> | 3 | Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage)          |
| <u>   </u> | 4 | Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”)         |
| <u>   </u> | 5 | Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”)              |
| <u>X</u>   | 6 | Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”)                               |
| <u>   </u> | 7 | Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)   |
| <u>   </u> | 8 | Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)                        |

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

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. 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____	NO__X__	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.

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 ____
• 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:**

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 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 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 program, institutional, and Essential Studies goals:**  
*The goal of focus this year did not clearly align with ES.*

#### 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:**

*No class or departmental actions were noted in the annual report that would signal closing the loop. The assessment plan and strategies appear to be the same as those noted during the assessment review performed in 2011 by the University Assessment Committee.*

#### 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.  
X \_\_\_\_\_ Assessment methods are not well-implemented.  
X \_\_\_\_\_ 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 RECOMMENDATIONS:

*In reviewing the annual report, it appears that the department is faced with a number of different challenges. We would like to encourage the department to have some additional conversations about rethinking and improving the assessment process so that the collected data has meaning and can be used for discussion, enhancements, and decision-making. There are several resources available on the UND University Assessment website including the availability of Assessment Consultants if you need assistance.*

#### 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	<u>Kevin Buettner</u>	<u>Shari Nelson</u>	<u>Brett Johnson</u>
	Department	<u>Nursing</u>	<u>SSC</u>	<u>Student Government</u>
	Phone Number	<u>777-4509</u>	<u>777-0562</u>	<u>777-4377</u>
	e-mail	<u>kevin.buettner@und.edu</u>	<u>shari.nelson@und.edu</u>	<u>brett.johnson.6@my.und.edu</u>

-----

Section 1: \_\_Q\_\_    Section 2: \_\_Q\_\_    Section 3: \_\_Q\_\_    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

*Revision 9/25/13*

**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**  
**Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-2013 Annual Reports**  
**UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

**DEPARTMENT** Languages **DATE** May 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014

**PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW** German Studies Program

**COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW** Kevin Buettner, Shari Nelson, Brett Johnson

**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 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 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.*

*For the German major specifically, it appears the focus was on culture. It was noted in the FY 2013 Annual Report that the curriculum underwent a completely revised curriculum in 2012-2013 and they are now the German Studies Program. The section on the German Studies Program in the Annual Report was focused on providing an overview of the changes within the curriculum rather than focusing on assessment methods or presenting results, of which the program stated they had no results to share at this time. The German Studies Program should make sure it updates the Languages Department Assessment Plan to ensure that representative courses are listed for the rotation that is used to address the three department assessment goals.*

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.

- |             |   |  |
|-------------|---|--|
| <u>X</u>    | 1 | Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”) |
| <u>    </u> | 2 | Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)       |
| <u>    </u> | 3 | Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage)          |
| <u>    </u> | 4 | Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”)         |
| <u>    </u> | 5 | Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”)              |
| <u>X</u>    | 6 | Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”)                               |
| <u>    </u> | 7 | Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)   |
| <u>    </u> | 8 | Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)                        |

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

*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. ASSESSMENT METHODS

- Were any specific assessment methods referenced? YES\_\_\_\_ NO\_\_\_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N \_\_X\_\_
- 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 measures” approach? YES\_\_X\_\_ NO\_\_\_\_ 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.*

*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/N \_\_X\_\_
- 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:**

First Year German: *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.*

Second Year German: *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.”*

Third Year German: 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.

Fourth Year German: 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.

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 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 program, institutional, and Essential Studies goals:**  
The goal of focus this year did not clearly align with ES.

#### 4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?

YES \_\_\_\_\_ 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:

There was one comment that we noted where actions were taken on the basis of assessment result. In First Year German, they stated “in reaction to student comments, we have revised this program slightly and increased cultural readings and activities.” In the future, it would be great if more examples could be provided that clearly show closing the loop.

#### 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 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 REVIEWED

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

☒ Assessment plan (as posted)  
☐ Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	<u>Kevin Buettner</u>	<u>Shari Nelson</u>	<u>Brett Johnson</u>
	Department	<u>Nursing</u>	<u>SSC</u>	<u>Student Government</u>
	Phone Number	<u>777-4509</u>	<u>777-0562</u>	<u>777-4377</u>
	e-mail	<u>kevin.buettner@und.edu</u>	<u>shari.nelson@und.edu</u>	<u>brett.johnson.6@my.und.edu</u>

Section 1: ☐ Y ☐ Q    Section 2: ☐ Q ☐ Q    Section 3: ☐ Q ☐ Q    Section 4: ☐ Q ☐ Q

### 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

Revision 9/25/13



**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**  
**Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-2013 Annual Reports**  
**UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

**DEPARTMENT** Languages **DATE** April 24, 2014

**PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW** Norwegian

**COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW** Kevin Buettner, Shari Nelson, Brett Johnson

**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 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 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.*

*For the Norwegian major, the focus for 2012 – 2013 was to demonstrate knowledge of literatures in the target language. The three objectives (2.1-2.3) identified in the broad Languages Department Assessment plan were clearly utilized by the Norwegian major in the Annual Report.*

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.

- |               |   |  |
|---------------|---|--|
| <u>  X  </u>  | 1 | Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”) |
| <u>      </u> | 2 | Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)       |
| <u>      </u> | 3 | Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage)          |
| <u>      </u> | 4 | Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”)         |
| <u>      </u> | 5 | Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”)              |
| <u>  X  </u>  | 6 | Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”)                               |
| <u>      </u> | 7 | Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)   |
| <u>      </u> | 8 | Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)                        |

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

*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 measures” approach?	YES__X__	NO____	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.*

*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?	YES____	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N __X__
• Were the results tied to goals for student 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.*

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 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 program, institutional, and Essential Studies goals:**  
*The goal of focus this year did not clearly align with ES.*

#### 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:**

*No class or departmental actions were noted in the annual report that would signal closing the loop.*

#### SUMMARY

##### *Strengths*

- ☐ 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.)

##### *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.
- X 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 Norwegian major is definitely on the right path. 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
- ☐ Appendices (cited in annual report)
- X Other (please describe)  
*Previous annual reports*

- X Assessment plan (as posted)
- X Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	<u>Kevin Buettner</u>	<u>Shari Nelson</u>	<u>Brett Johnson</u>
	Department	<u>Nursing</u>	<u>SSC</u>	<u>Student Government</u>
	Phone Number	<u>777-4509</u>	<u>777-0562</u>	<u>777-4377</u>
	e-mail	<u>kevin.buettner@und.edu</u>	<u>shari.nelson@und.edu</u>	<u>brett.johnson.6@my.und.edu</u>

-----

Section 1: Q    Section 2: Y    Section 3: Q    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

*Revision 9/25/13*

**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**  
**Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-2013 Annual Reports**  
**UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

**DEPARTMENT** Languages **DATE** May 8, 2014

**PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW** Spanish

**COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW** Kevin Buettner, Shari Nelson, Brett Johnson

**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 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 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 Spanish major focused on the cultural part of the assessment. It is also unclear if the Spanish major had any other goals specifically under “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.

- |             |   |  |
|-------------|---|--|
| <u>X</u>    | 1 | Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”) |
| <u>    </u> | 2 | Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)       |
| <u>    </u> | 3 | Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage)          |
| <u>    </u> | 4 | Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”)         |
| <u>    </u> | 5 | Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”)              |
| <u>X</u>    | 6 | Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”)                               |
| <u>    </u> | 7 | Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)   |
| <u>    </u> | 8 | Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)                        |

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

*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.”*

## 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      NO X 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

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

### **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 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:**

*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*

- ☐ 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:

*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

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <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)<br><i>Previous annual reports</i> |   |

Reviewer(s):	Name	<u>Kevin Buettner</u>	<u>Shari Nelson</u>	<u>Brett Johnson</u>
	Department	<u>Nursing</u>	<u>SSC</u>	<u>Student Government</u>
	Phone Number	<u>777-4509</u>	<u>777-0562</u>	<u>777-4377</u>
	e-mail	<u>kevin.buettner@und.edu</u>	<u>shari.nelson@und.edu</u>	<u>brett.johnson.6@my.und.edu</u>

Section 1: Q    Section 2: Y    Section 3: Q    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

*Revision 9/25/13*