

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

DEPARTMENT Counseling Psychology& Community Services **DATE** 2-22-13

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Rehabilitation & Human Services

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Joan Hawthorne, Sukhvarsh Jerath

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES <u> </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:

Goals for this program, in the new assessment plan, are described as topic areas (e.g., “ethics and professional practice”) rather than as competencies. From looking at the old plan, it appears that the program is aligned with external standards which likely include specific objectives or learning outcomes related to each topic area, but they are not indicated in the new plan. Clear learning outcome language makes it much easier to identify appropriate assessment strategies and maintain alignment from goals through methods, results, and loop-closing.

In addition to the Departmental goals, please also consider UND’s Institutional and Essential Studies goals for student learning (shown in alignment within parentheses) and identify which goals are similar to departmental goals.

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

Comments regarding departmental goals and alignment of departmental goals with institutional and Essential Studies goals:

Although student behaviors are not identified, it is clear that diversity, citizenship, and communication align with the various competency areas listed.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

- | | | | |
|--|-----------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments:

It appears from example data provided and from comments in the annual report that there is a specific list of learning objectives, perhaps identified by course, that aligns with the learning topic areas which are identified as accreditation standards. We don’t have that information available in either the annual report or the assessment plan. It would be very helpful to add that to the 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:

It is difficult for an outside reader to see the alignment between results and goals, but comments in the annual report about needed improvements do clearly link back to learning competency areas – which demonstrates that additional information exists, very possibly in the accreditation standards, which clarifies alignment.

In addition to departmental goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. Indicate any goals for which the department presents findings, and, for indicated items, describe findings below. .

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

Faculty recognized a need for more emphasis on diversity and are making that change. Additional service/citizenship activities also have been incorporated.

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:

Actions are being taken but the alignment is not as clear as would be desirable.

SUMMARY

<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Areas for Improvement</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> A specific plan for assessment is in place.	<input type="checkbox"/> No specific plan for assessment is in place.
<input type="checkbox"/> Student learning goals are well-articulated.	<input type="checkbox"/> Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment methods are clearly described.	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment methods are not clearly described.
<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment methods are appropriately selected.	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment methods are well-implemented.	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Direct and indirect methods are implemented.	<input type="checkbox"/> A single type of assessment methods predominates.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are reported.	<input type="checkbox"/> No results are reported.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is tied to evidence.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

It would be very helpful to add a bit more detail to the posted assessment plan (so that it's available to an outsider, but doesn't need to be written into each annual report). That information should include the specific learning objectives, since

they appear to be in place. The information should also include a clearer tracking of alignment of goals, objectives, and methods. With that information, it would be much easier to make sense of the results and loop-closing activities reported. On the one hand, it appears clear that information is being collected which is useful for program planning and loop-closing. On the other hand, the additional clarity would be very helpful for readers.

However, we want to note as strengths the very clear demonstration that results are being collected and are being used. We're happy to see programs getting to that loop-closing level with assessment activities.

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 type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe)	

Reviewer(s):	Name	Joan Hawthorne__	Sukhvarsh Jerath__	_____
	Department	Academic Affairs__	Civil Engineering__	_____
	Phone Number	__7-4684_____	__7-3564_____	_____
	e-mail	joan.hawthorne@und.edu	_sukhvarsh.jerath@engr.und.edu	_____

Section 1: __?__ Section 2: __?__ Section 3: __Y__ Section 4: __Y__

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected in other years)
- N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA = no information reported
- ? = action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done