DEPARTMENT_____<u>Psychology</u>_____**DATE**__<u>April 22, 2014</u>_____

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW ____<u>Psychology undergraduate program</u>_____

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW___<u>Kenneth Ruit and Sukhvarsh Jerath</u>_____

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

* Were any goals referenced?   YES √   NO____   QUALIFIED Y/N ___
* If so, were goals well-articulated?   YES____   NO____   QUALIFIED Y/N √
* Do goals address student learning?   YES √   NO____   QUALIFIED Y/N ___

Comments: The current assessment plan of the undergraduate program in the Department of Psychology is dated 2013. The seven generally-stated goals are aligned with specific educational experiences and assessment methods. A timeline for assessment activities is included along with who is responsible for carrying out the assessment plan and how the results will be used for decision-making. The assessment plan includes very few specific, measurable objectives that address goals; clearly articulating goals as well as objectives for each goal would be helpful in communicating what students are expected to know or be able to do upon completion of the program. For example, Goal 7 is simply stated as "Diversity"; as such it communicates very little in terms of what students are expected to know or be able to do.

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.

* √   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 program goals and alignment with institutional and Essential Studies goals: All of the above Essential Studies goals (with the exception of 'lifelong learning') are explicitly stated among the program goals for student learning. Goal 5 addresses the supportiveness and promotion of a departmental 'environment for learning', which may address the encouragement of an attitude of life-long learning, but it is not explicitly stated in those terms.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

Were any specific assessment methods referenced?   YES √   NO____   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 faculty collected and analyzed data from student focus groups, scores from a newly implemented Departmental Assessment Examination (DAE), evaluation of a writing assignment from a sample of students in upper level courses, and transcript review. Each of these direct and indirect assessment methods are specifically referenced in the current departmental assessment plan.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?   YES √   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 ____
- 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: Specific results were reported for each of the direct and indirect assessment methods employed. Student focus groups identified specific strengths of the program as well as concerns/areas for improvement. Not only was student satisfaction assessed, but student learning was explicitly addressed. For example, students are concerned about the adequacy of the development of their skills in understanding statistics and using statistical software tools to enhance their learning. Students are also concerned about the adequacy of instruction in scientific writing. The DAE is a new instrument designed by the department to measure student knowledge in five sub-areas related to departmental goals: general psychology, statistics, research methods, diversity, and history of psychology. Student written work is evaluated using previously established rubrics. Transcript review is used to monitor the number of students who enroll in experiential learning opportunities, particularly research assistant experiences, which has decreased slightly over the last year.

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 direct and indirect assessment methods employed address each of the department's stated student learning goals. The initial administration of the DAE led faculty to the conclusion that students are not learning at the level desired in research methods or diversity. In fact, the DAE has made it possible for faculty to do specific item analysis that has led them to specific areas of deficiency. For example, within-subjects design, operational definitions, and quasi-experimental design were identified as specific topics in research methods that require improvement. Also, modern prejudice and benevolent/hostile sexism were identified as areas requiring improvement in diversity.

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: The department does not indicate that any curricular improvements/changes are necessary or will be made on the basis of the reported assessment results. However, the department recognizes that more flexibility in how and when the DAE is administered in the future may improve student incentive to perform well on the examination. Also, while the department has previously discussed the possibility of adding a writing course to the curriculum, limited resources have not made that possible. Writing mechanics will continue to be taught in the relevant courses. The possibility of a student-run journal has been proposed to promote deeper engagement in professional writing in the discipline. Also, recent efforts have focused on the provision of experiential learning opportunities and improving the process for gaining practical experience. The department has identified improvement of student advising and professional skill development for teaching assistants as a priority for the upcoming year.

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.

√   Direct and indirect methods are implemented.   _____A single type of assessment methods predominates.

√   Results are reported.   _____ No results are reported.

√   Results are tied to closing the loop.   _____ 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: *The Department of Psychology places a high priority on assessment of student learning. Goals for student learning are established and the psychology faculty has implemented direct and indirect assessment methods that have yielded results regarding what their majors have learned as well as programmatic strengths and areas for improvement. The implementation of these assessment methods, especially the first administration of the DAE, has revealed how approaches to assessment of student learning could be refined. The committee recommends that the department give consideration to more clearly articulating the currently generally-stated learning goals as well as constructing specific, measurable objectives that address each goal; clearly articulating goals as well as objectives for each goal would be helpful in communicating what students are expected to know or be able to do upon completion of the program. In addition, actions that are directed at improving student learning in addition to those directed at improving student satisfaction will be important elements of "closing the loop" on departmental assessment activities for the future.*

MATERIALS REVIEWED

√   Annual report   √   Assessment plan (as posted)

_____ Appendices (cited in annual report)   √   Previous assessment review

_____ Other (please describe)

Reviewer(s):	Name	Kenneth Ruit	Sukhvarsh Jerath
	Department	Basic Sciences	Civil Engineering
	Phone Number	777-2570	777-3564
	e-mail	kenneth.ruit@med.und.edu	sukhvarsh.jerath@und.edu

Section 1: __Q___   Section 2: __Y___   Section 3: __Y___   Section 4: __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 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

DEPARTMENT_____**Psychology**_____**DATE**_____**April 22, 2014**_____

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW ____**M.A. and M.S. – Forensic Psychology**_____

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW___**Kenneth Ruit and Sukhvarsh Jerath**__

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- Were any goals referenced?   YES √   NO__   QUALIFIED Y/N ___
- If so, were goals well-articulated?   YES___   NO___   QUALIFIED Y/N √
- Do goals address student learning?   YES___   NO___   QUALIFIED Y/N √

Comments: Seven goals (with associated objectives) are articulated for the forensic psychology programs. Five of the goals directly address student learning: ethical standards; use of theory, concepts, and propositions to explain or interpret forsensic psychological questions; ability to conduct psychological research; exploring career options; and, presenting and publishing research. The remaining goals address attracting and retaining highly qualified students in the program and students valuing their graduate experience in the program. Certain goals do distinguish between the MA and MS program in terms of objectives/expectations with respect to the goals. There is no current assessment plan for the forensic programs posted on the UND assessment plan website.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

Were any specific assessment methods referenced?   YES √   NO____   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: Each program goal is supported by objectives that are accompanied by assessment methods that include both direct (e.g., exam performance, student written work, student presentations, thesis/independent study) and indirect (e.g., student satisfaction survey) methods. Some misalignment between goals and assessment methods exists, however. For example, it is not clear how the number of student completing human subjects online training or the number of courses that include discussion of ethical issues assess whether students adhere to ethical standards in their professional endeavors.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?   YES √   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 √
- 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: Course grades, assignment/thesis/independent study grades, student feedback and student satisfaction as well as scholarly activities (presentation/publication) are aligned with goals; some results reflect elements of student learning but most others are less specifically indicative about what students have actually learned. No summative conclusions are drawn by the faculty about how assessment results indicate need for improvement.

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: While goals, objectives, and assessment methods are addressed, the FY13 annual report does not include any
indication about how the results of assessment are being discussed by the faculty or will be used to change or improve the
curriculum or any other aspect of the programs, likely because the programs are so new.*

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.
√ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.	____ A single type of assessment methods predominates.
√ Results are reported.	____ No results are reported.
____Results are tied to closing the loop.	√ 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: *These new programs would be well-served by the
establishment (and posting on the UND assessment plan website) of a specific plan for assessment of student learning that
emerges from statements of goals and objectives that are not so much about what the program will deliver but about what
students will know or be able to do, i.e., what they will learn. In addition, each program (MA and MS) should have
student learning goals that distinguish them from one another. Assessment methods should be appropriately aligned with
stated goals for student learning. Some results reflect student learning, whereas most others, such as course and
assignment grades, tend to be less specifically indicative about what students have actually learned since summative
course grades, for example, cannot be easily disaggregated according to specifically-stated learning outcomes. This
suggests that there may be other types of data the faculty could consider that may be more informative than course grades
in documenting achievement of student learning. The committee recommends that the faculty intentionally come to
summative, documentable conclusions about how assessment results either support the achievement of student learning
goals or, alternatively, indicate need for improvement – and, what actions will be subsequently taken as important
elements of "closing the loop".*

MATERIALS REVIEWED

√   Annual report   _____Assessment plan (as posted)
_____ Appendices (cited in annual report)   _____ Previous assessment review
_____ Other (please describe)

Reviewer(s):	Name	Kenneth Ruit	Sukhvarsh Jerath
	Department	Basic Sciences	Civil Engineering
	Phone Number	777-2570	777-3564
	e-mail	kenneth.ruit@med.und.edu	sukhvarsh.jerath@und.edu

Section 1: __Q___   Section 2: __Q___   Section 3: __Q___   Section 4: __NA___

Coding Key:

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

    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 2012-13 Annual Reports
GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT_____Psychology_____DATE_____April 22, 2014_____

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW _____M.A. and Ph.D. – General/Experimental Psychology____

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW____Kenneth Ruit and Sukhvarsh Jerath_____

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

• Were any goals referenced?	YES √	NO_-__	QUALIFIED Y/N ___
• If so, were goals well-articulated?	YES √	NO_-__	QUALIFIED Y/N ___
• Do goals address student learning?	YES √	NO_-__	QUALIFIED Y/N ___

Comments: The general/experimental psychology graduate program assessment plan articulates two primary program goals with associated objectives that are clear and address what students are expected to know or be able to do upon completion of the program. The goals and objectives do not distinguish between masters and doctoral level training. The current assessment plan document posted on the website is dated April 2013.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

Were any specific assessment methods referenced?	YES √	NO____	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: Each program goal is supported by relevant, generally measurable objectives that are accompanied by assessment methods that include both direct (e.g., course exam scores, student written work, comprehensive examinations, thesis/dissertation) and indirect (e.g., individual annual student meetings/interviews, student survey) methods. Departmentally-established scoring metrics are used to evaluate comprehensive exam performance, thesis/dissertation proposals, and thesis/dissertation final oral examinations.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES √	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 √
• 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: Mean scores were reported for measures of comprehensive exam response quality, measures of thesis/dissertation proposal quality and measures of thesis/dissertation final oral examination quality. The positivity of mean scores led program faculty to the conclusion that student learning goals had been met. Moreover, the results of student surveys about their own engagement in professional societies and in presentation and publication indicated that students are meeting goals for scholarly accomplishment. Results reported qualitatively about faculty impressions of the "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" nature of student performance on comprehensive examinations and theses/dissertations may be less specifically indicative about what students have actually learned. While course examinations and written

assignments, for example, are listed as specific direct assessment methods, no results are reported on the basis of the implementation of those methods. Students, in general, seem to be doing OK according to faculty scoring rubrics but no summative conclusions are drawn by the faculty on the basis of specifically-reported objective evidence of student learning indicating either accomplishment of goals and/or need for improvement.

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: Faculty have generally come to the conclusion that students are meeting the stated learning goals on the basis of the reported assessment results. The department reports that "special attention will be given to the subject of comprehensive exams and ways of improving this process will be sought and considered". How assessment results led faculty to that action plan is unclear from the report.

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.
√	Direct and indirect methods are implemented.	____	A single type of assessment methods predominates.
√	Results are reported.	____	No results are reported.
____	Results are tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is tied to evidence.)	√	Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS: *The Department of Psychology places a high priority on assessment of student learning. Goals for student learning for the general/experimental psychology program are clear and succinct, although they do not distinguish between masters and doctoral level training. Distinct goals for student learning should be developed separately (where appropriate) for the masters and doctoral degrees since there are clear differences in outcomes between masters and doctoral-level training.   The psychology faculty has implemented direct and indirect assessment methods that have yielded results regarding what their students have learned. Departmentally-established scoring metrics are used to evaluate comprehensive exam performance, thesis/dissertation proposals, and thesis/dissertation final oral examinations. Results reported qualitatively about faculty impressions of the "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" nature of student performance may be less specifically indicative about what students have actually learned in comparison to the use of more documentable, objective evidence of student learning (e.g., direct assessments such as course examinations, student written work) indicating either accomplishment of goals and/or need for improvement. Clearer documentable outcomes would provide much more direction in "closing the loop" decision-making.*

MATERIALS REVIEWED

√	Annual report	√	Assessment plan (as posted)
_____	Appendices (cited in annual report)	√	Previous assessment review
_____	Other (please describe)		

Reviewer(s):	Name	Kenneth Ruit	Sukhvarsh Jerath
	Department	Basic Sciences	Civil Engineering
	Phone Number	777-2570	777-3564
	e-mail	kenneth.ruit@med.und.edu	sukhvarsh.jerath@und.edu

Section 1: __Y___   Section 2: __Y___   Section 3: __Q___   Section 4: __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

DEPARTMENT_____<u>**Psychology**</u>_____**DATE**_____<u>**April 22, 2014**</u>_____

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW _____<u>**Ph.D. – Clinical Psychology**</u>_____ _____

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW___<u>**Kenneth Ruit and Sukhvarsh Jerath**</u>_____

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- Were any goals referenced?   YES___   NO___   QUALIFIED Y/N √
- If so, were goals well-articulated?   YES √   NO___   QUALIFIED Y/N ___
- Do goals address student learning?   YES √   NO___   QUALIFIED Y/N ___

Comments: The clinical psychology doctoral program Annual Program Outcome Data report reproduced in the department's FY13 Annual Report articulates four primary program outcomes that are clear and address what students are expected to know or be able to do upon completion of the program. The "Program Outcomes, Standards and Target Criteria" in the FY13 Annual Report align best with "Goals, Objectives and Competencies" listed in a 2010 program document on the assessment plan website. The 2013 program document also included on the assessment plan website includes five quite different goals, which are called "current" in the document. It is unclear which list of goals/outcomes the program is using going forward.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

Were any specific assessment methods referenced?   YES √   NO____   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: Each program outcome included in the FY13 Annual Report is supported by relevant, measurable "standards" that are accompanied by specifically-stated target criteria and assessment methods that include both direct (e.g., exam scores, including performance on the Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology [EPPP], student presentations and publications) and indirect (e.g., student and alumni surveys) methods.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?   YES √   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 √
- 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: Outcome and student survey data are reported for each "standard" dating back, in some cases, annually to 2002. Course grades, student feedback, student satisfaction, as well as performance in very specific content areas addressed in the EPPP are aligned with goals; some results clearly reflect student learning (such as exam performance in focused content areas), whereas others, such as course grades, may be less specifically indicative about what students have actually learned. Many results are presented; some results indicate that target criteria are met and others indicate opportunity for

improvement. No summative conclusions are drawn by the faculty about how the results indicate need for improvement (if any).

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: While goals, objectives, assessment methods (and the voluminous results/data generated) are abundantly clear and well-documented, the FY13 annual report does not include any indication about how the results of assessment are being discussed by the faculty or will be used to change or improve the curriculum or any other aspect of the program.

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.
√ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.	____ A single type of assessment methods predominates.
√ Results are reported.	____ No results are reported.
____ Results are tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is tied to evidence.)	√ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS: *The Department of Psychology places a high priority on assessment of student learning. Goals for student learning included in the FY13 Annual Report are well-articulated, although judging from the materials posted on the assessment plan website, it is unclear which specific set of goals and objectives are current and will be used by the department moving forward. The psychology faculty has implemented direct and indirect assessment methods that have yielded results regarding what their students have learned. Course grades, student feedback, student satisfaction, as well as performance in very specific content areas addressed in the EPPP are aligned with goals for student learning; some results clearly reflect student learning (such as exam performance in focused content areas), whereas others, such as course grades, tend to be less specifically indicative about what students have actually learned since summative course grades cannot be easily disaggregated according to specifically-stated learning outcomes. This suggests that there may be other types of data the faculty could consider that may be more informative than course grades in documenting achievement of student learning. Many results are presented; some results indicate that target criteria are met and others indicate opportunity for improvement. The committee recommends that the faculty 1) clearly identify which list of goals and objectives will form the basis for curricular and assessment planning moving forward, and 2) intentionally come to summative, documentable conclusions about how assessment results either support the achievement of student learning goals or, alternatively, indicate need for improvement – and, what actions will be subsequently taken as important elements of "closing the loop".*

MATERIALS REVIEWED

√ Annual report	√ Assessment plan (as posted)
_____ Appendices (cited in annual report)	√ Previous assessment review
_____ Other (please describe)	

Reviewer(s):	Name	Kenneth Ruit	Sukhvarsh Jerath
	Department	Basic Sciences	Civil Engineering
	Phone Number	777-2570	777-3564

e-mail   kenneth.ruit@med.und.edu   sukhvarsh.jerath@und.edu

Section 1: __Q___   Section 2: __Y___   Section 3: __Y___   Section 4: __NA___

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