

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 Recreation and Tourism Studies

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:

We note that your assessment plan refers to the “competencies” developed by the National Council on Accreditation of the National Recreation and Park Association, and it may be that your goals need to be articulated as they are in order to align with your accreditor’s expectations. However, it is often easier to plan assessments if you are able to phrase goals so they clearly identify what students are expected to do (i.e., use verbs like apply, analyze, and evaluate). Many of the Recreation learning outcomes, in contrast, begin with the verb “understand,” and that less concrete language can make assessment more challenging.

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”)
- X 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”)
- X 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”)
- 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:

Communication and analysis of data are included in the Recreation goals, indicating an alignment with two of the ES goals. In addition, information literacy and diversity are identified within goals for specific courses in the program.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

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

Comments:

The program is collecting data in selected courses and from internship supervisors (in addition to ES revalidation assessments, also described). The annual report notes that it is difficult to fully implement intended in-course methods with a number of the courses taught by part-time faculty.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

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

Comments:

It appears from comments in the annual report that the internship rubric may align with the learning outcomes, but it's difficult to be certain without seeing the rubric itself. We noted that the results did identify a mismatch between internship sites and learning goals had been identified as presenting an opportunity for program improvement – either through better selection of internship sites or through better coordination with internship supervisors to ensure that the appropriate range of learning outcomes could be practiced and demonstrated.

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

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

Comments regarding results and the application of results to departmental, institutional and Essential Studies goals:

The report notes that critical thinking had been examined in an ES class validated for that goal, and positive findings had been documented.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

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

Comments:

The annual report describes steps taken at both the course level and the program level, but it's too soon to know the outcome of those changes.

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:

It is clear that assessment is occurring, results are being collected, and information is being fed back into program planning. However, the report also makes clear that the reliance on part-time faculty is making it difficult to successfully and coherently implement some planned assessments – people who aren't rooted in the program don't always have an understanding of assessment or the motivation to be deeply engaged. From the perspective of an outside reader, it would have been really helpful to have the rubric used for scoring by internship supervisors included with the plan, since it was difficult, without that information, to see how results aligned with goals. On the other hand, comments included in the annual report do suggest that the alignment exists.

We note that an updated assessment plan was recently posted and are pleased to see that – it makes it much easier for us to see how the annual report information and the assessment plan information are intended to work together.

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: ☒ Y ☐ N Section 2: ☒ Y ☐ N Section 3: ☐ ? ☐ NA Section 4: ☒ Y ☐ 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)
- 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

Revision 10/11/12