## UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in \_2013-14\_\_\_\_\_

## **UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

<b>DEPARTMENT</b> Geology & Geological Engineeri	ng		DATE	_2/17/15
PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEWB.S. i	n Environme	ntal Geoscie	nce	
COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVI	EWMary	K. Askim-Le	ovseth and	Surojit Gupta
1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS				
<ul><li>Were any goals referenced?</li><li>If so, were goals well articulated?</li><li>Do goals address student learning?</li></ul>	YES YES YES	NO	QUALIFIE QUALIFIE QUALIFIE	D Y/N
Comments:				
There was no Assessment Plan posted or any reference to the Geology and Geological Engineering.	program in th	e Assessment	Annual Rep	ort for the Department o
In addition to the program goals, please also consider UND's (shown in alignment within parentheses) and identify which generally and reasoning — critical thinking (or "beta thinking and reasoning — creative thinking (or "beta thinking and reasoning — creative thinking (or "beta thinking and reasoning — quantitative reasoning (and thinking and thinking and thinking and thinking and thinking and reasoning — quantitative reasoning (and thinking and thinking and thinking and thinking and thinking and thinki	goals are similarly and speak in variantellectually e intellectually "apply empiricatefor effect y and use that g learning")	r to program rious settings curious"; ana creative"; exeal dataana ive, efficient, understanding ities and for t	goals. with a sense lyze, synther plore, disco- lyze graphic and ethical g") he world")	e of purpose/audience") size, evaluate) ver, engage) al information")
2. ASSESSMENT METHODS				
<ul> <li>Were any specific assessment methods referenced?</li> <li>If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual</li> </ul>	YES	NO_ <i>X</i> _	QUALIFIE	D Y/N
goals?  • Were both direct and indirect assessment	YES	NO	QUALIFIE	D Y/N
methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach?	YES	NO	QUALIFIE	D Y/N

Comments:

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS					
Were any assessment results reported?	YES	NOX_	QUALIFIED Y/N		
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
<ul><li>they specifically affirm achievement of goals?</li><li>If so, were the results clear in terms of how</li></ul>	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N		
they indicate need for improvement?	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N		
Were the results tied to goals for student			<b>*</b>		
learning?	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N		
Comments:					
In addition to program goals, some assessment results may be any goals for which the program presents findings, and, for in	ndicated item and speak in ver- e intellectuall be intellectuall ("apply empi- nate for effe- ty and use that g learning") r their communication.	s, describe fin various setting y curious"; and lly creative"; rical dataan ective, efficient understand	ndings below. gs with a sense of purpose/audience") nalyze, synthesize, evaluate) explore, discover, engage) nalyze graphical information") nt, and ethical use") ing") r the world")		
Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?	YES	NO_ <i>X</i> _	QUALIFIED Y/N		
<ul> <li>If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?</li> </ul>	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N		
Comments:					
SUMMARY Strengths		Areas	for Improvement		
A specific plan for assessment is in placeStudent learning goals are well-articulated.	X_ No specific plan for assessment is in place 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-implementedDirect and indirect methods are implemented.	sment methods are not well-implemented.				
Brect and indirect methods are implementedResults are reported.		A single type of assessment methods predominates 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:**

It was requested by the Committee in the 2012 review that the Department develop an Assessment Plan for the program in the upcoming year; that has not been done. The Department faculty need to address this important component of offering a program.

## MATERIALS REVIEWED

Annual AssessnX Previou	assessment report Report nent plan (as posted) s assessment review blease describe)				
Reviewer(s):	Name Department Phone Number e-mail	Mary K. Askim-Lovseth Marketing 777-2930 maskim@business.und.edu	Surojit Gupta Mechanical Engineering 777-1632 surojit.gupta@und.edu		
Section 1:N	Section 2: <i>N</i> S	Section 3:N Section 4: _	_N		
		•	d the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing tinds of data to be collected and analyzed in other		
	= qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done				

= no, it is unclear whether it was done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning

Revised Sept 24, 2014