## Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2014 - 2015

# UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

| DEPARTMEN           | Medical Laboratory Science      | ence           |  |     | DAT        | E | April *, 2016   |  |  |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|--|-----|------------|---|-----------------|--|--|
| PROGRAM(S           | ) COVERED IN REVIEW             | B.S. in Medica | al Laboratory Scie                           | nce |            |   |                 |  |  |
| COMMITTEE<br>REVIEW | E MEMBER(S) CONDUCTI            | ING            | Bradley Myers, Deborah Worley & Shawn McHale |     |            |   |                 |  |  |
| 1. STUDENT          | Γ LEARNING GOALS                |                |  |     |            |   |                 |  |  |
| • Were a            | any goals referenced?           |                | X  | Yes | No         |   | Qualified Y/N   |  |  |
| • If so, v          | were goals well-articulated?    |                | X  | Yes | No         |   | Qualified Y/N   |  |  |
| • Do goo            | als address student learning?   |                | X  | Yes | No         |   | Qualified Y/N   |  |  |
| Y Y                 |                                 |                |  |     |            |   |                 |  |  |
|                     | IENT METHODS                    | 19             | v  | V   | <b>N</b> Y |   | Overlief of WAY |  |  |
|                     | fic assessment methods refere   |                | <u>X</u>                                     | Yes | No         |   | Qualified Y/N   |  |  |
| • If so, v          | were specifically chosen assess | sment methods  |  | Yes | X No       |   | Qualified Y/N   |  |  |

| <ul> <li>appropriately aligned with individual goals?</li> <li>Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach?</li> </ul>   |  | Yes  | X   | _ No  | Qualified Y/N   |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| Comments: The Department reports that it collected and reviewed data reports that it "focused on reviewing the performance of our recent gradentry-level examination." No data from that review was reported, but the performing well on the national board of certification. It should be noted occurred prior to the adoption of the Department's new assessment plane   | duates<br>e Depa<br>d that a   | on our<br>irtment  | profes.<br>did co   | sion's no<br>nclude i   | ational board of certification<br>that all its graduates "are   |
| 3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS  |  |  |   |   |   |
| Were any assessment results reported?  | X  | Yes  |   | No  | Qualified Y/N   |
| <ul> <li>If so, were the results clear in terms of how they<br/>specifically affirm achievement of goals?</li> </ul>   |  | Yes  | X   | No  | Qualified Y/N   |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?  |  | Yes  | X   | No  | Qualified Y/N   |
| Were the results tied to goals of student learning?  | X  | Yes  |   | No  | Qualified Y/N   |
| Department consolidated the data from its BS students with those in its I believe I was adequately prepared for MLS 470 level coursework?"62 of agreed with the statement that they felt prepared for MLS 470 level cour working on reviewing the curriculum change within its courses that teac years, are associated with an increase in the scores of the Department's Board of Certification examination, which now exceed the national aver   | f the 72<br>sework<br>ch immi<br>gradu   | 2 on-ca<br>k. The I<br>unolog  | impus s<br>Depart<br>y. " The   | students<br>ment als<br>e change                                    | and 7 of the 7 online students or eports that it has "been is, implement over the last five   |
| believe I was adequately prepared for MLS 470 level coursework? "62 of agreed with the statement that they felt prepared for MLS 470 level cours working on reviewing the curriculum change within its courses that teach years, are associated with an increase in the scores of the Department's Board of Certification examination, which now exceed the national aver  | of the 72<br>rsework<br>th imming graduates<br>graduates<br>grage.   | 2 on-ca<br>k. The I<br>unolog<br>ates on   | impus and and and and and and   | students<br>ment als<br>e change<br>nmunolo<br>Essentia             | and 7 of the 7 online students o reports that it has "been is, implement over the last five gy subpart of the ASCP MLS all Studies goals. Please identify   |
| believe I was adequately prepared for MLS 470 level coursework? "62 of agreed with the statement that they felt prepared for MLS 470 level courseworking on reviewing the curriculum change within its courses that teach years, are associated with an increase in the scores of the Department's Board of Certification examination, which now exceed the national average and the program goals, some assessment results may be applicable those results which are applicable to institutional/Essential Studies goal below.  | of the 72<br>rsework<br>th imming radult<br>gradult<br>age.  | 2 on-ca<br>k. The I<br>unolog<br>ates on<br>titution<br>ement.   | Depart.  The the imal and  For in   | students<br>ment als<br>e change<br>munolo<br>Essentia<br>dicated   | and 7 of the 7 online students or eports that it has "been es, implement over the last five gy subpart of the ASCP MLS all Studies goals. Please identify items, please describe findings   |
| believe I was adequately prepared for MLS 470 level coursework? "62 of agreed with the statement that they felt prepared for MLS 470 level courseworking on reviewing the curriculum change within its courses that teach years, are associated with an increase in the scores of the Department's Board of Certification examination, which now exceed the national average. In addition to program goals, some assessment results may be applicable those results which are applicable to institutional/Essential Studies goal   | of the 72 sework the immurage. The to instance to instance the total speak attellection tellection the imply end to the implication end to the implicati | 2 on-ca<br>k. The landlog<br>unolog<br>ates on<br>titution<br>ement.<br>in vari-<br>ually continually continually continually<br>effective<br>that unoversity  | Depart.  Depart.  The image and and For in ous set urious creative al data.  The image are all data.  | Essentia<br>dicated<br>tings wi<br>c; analyz<br>cient, an<br>anding | and 7 of the 7 online students or eports that it has "been es, implement over the last five gy subpart of the ASCP MLS all Studies goals. Please identify items, please describe findings the a sense of purpose/audience, synthesize, evaluate) ore, discover, engage) e graphical information") dethical use")  |
| believe I was adequately prepared for MLS 470 level coursework? "62 of agreed with the statement that they felt prepared for MLS 470 level courseworking on reviewing the curriculum change within its courses that teach years, are associated with an increase in the scores of the Department's Board of Certification examination, which now exceed the national average and those results which are applicable to institutional/Essential Studies goal below.  1. Communication – written or oral ("able to write and 2. Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be in 3. Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be in 4. Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning ("a 5. Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluate 6. Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of diversity a 7. Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelong learning the state of the state  | of the 72 sework the immediate of the immediate of the instance of the instanc | 2 on-cak. The I  | Depart.  Depart.  The image of | Essentia<br>dicated<br>tings wi<br>c; analyz<br>cient, an<br>anding | and 7 of the 7 online students or eports that it has "been es, implement over the last five gy subpart of the ASCP MLS all Studies goals. Please identify items, please describe findings the a sense of purpose/audience, synthesize, evaluate) ore, discover, engage) e graphical information") dethical use") ") world")                               |
| believe I was adequately prepared for MLS 470 level coursework?"62 of agreed with the statement that they felt prepared for MLS 470 level cours working on reviewing the curriculum change within its courses that teach years, are associated with an increase in the scores of the Department's Board of Certification examination, which now exceed the national average and the second of Certification examination, which now exceed the national average and the second of Certification examination, which now exceed the national average and the second of Certification examination, which now exceed the national average and the second of Certification examination, which now exceed the national average and the second of Certification examination, which now exceed the national average and the second of Certification examination, which now exceed the national average and the second of Certification examination, which now exceed the national average and the second of Certification of the second of Certification examination, which now exceed the Department's Board of Certification examination, which now exceed the national average and the second of Certification of Certification examination, which now exceed the Department's Board of Certification of Certification examination, which now exceed the Department's Board of Certification of Certification examination in the scores of the Department's Board of Certification of Certification examination in the scores of the Department's Board of Certification of Certification examination in the scores of the Department's Board of Certification of Certification of Certification of Certification examination in the scores of the Department's Board of Certification of Certifi | of the 72 sework of immediately and intellect of the control of th | 2 on-cak. The lanology, ates on titution ement.  in variually continually cont | Depart.  Depart.  The image of | Essential dicated analyzer; explorantly analyzer, and ing           | and 7 of the 7 online students or reports that it has "been es, implement over the last five gy subpart of the ASCP MLS  all Studies goals. Please identify items, please describe findings the a sense of purpose/audience'e, synthesize, evaluate) ore, discover, engage) e graphical information") dethical use")  "")  world")  ential Studies goals: |
| believe I was adequately prepared for MLS 470 level coursework?"62 of agreed with the statement that they felt prepared for MLS 470 level courseworking on reviewing the curriculum change within its courses that teach years, are associated with an increase in the scores of the Department's Board of Certification examination, which now exceed the national average and the second of Certification examination, which now exceed the national average and the second of Certification examination, which now exceed the national average and the second of Certification examination, which now exceed the national average and the second of Certification examination, which now exceed the national average and the second of Certification examination, which now exceed the national average and the second of Certification examination, which now exceed the national average and the second of Certification examination, which now exceed the national average and the second of Certification of Tesults to programs and the application of the Comments regarding results and the application of results to programs.  | of the 72 sework the immediate of the immediate of the instance of the instanc | 2 on-cak. The I  | Depart.  Depart.  The image of | Essentia<br>dicated<br>tings wi<br>c; analyz<br>cient, an<br>anding | and 7 of the 7 online students or eports that it has "been es, implement over the last five gy subpart of the ASCP MLS all Studies goals. Please identify items, please describe findings the a sense of purpose/audience, synthesize, evaluate) ore, discover, engage) e graphical information") dethical use") ") world")                               |

|               | asse   | ssment results direc   | tly address goa   | als for student le                                       | arning?  |   |   |  |             |
|---------------|--|--|---|--|--|---|---|--|-------------|
| rev<br>ada    | ising cour<br>litional su                                | rses covering other o  | areas of the cu<br>site coordinate  | rriculum. It also<br>ors. This was don                   | reports the<br>ne in respo                       | nt it decided to i<br>nse to previous                                       | hire an add<br>student feed   | y courses as a model fo<br>itional staff person to p<br>dback identifying incre<br>artment | rovide      |
| SU            | MMARY  | Strengt  | hs  |  |  | Arec  | as for Impr   | ovement  |             |
| XXX           | Assessm<br>Assessm<br>Direct at<br>Results a<br>(Decisio | ic plan for assessme<br>learning goals are we<br>tent methods are cle<br>tent methods are app<br>tent methods are we<br>and indirect methods<br>are reported.<br>The tied to closing the<br>are tied to closing the<br>are making is tied to company to the<br>SUMMARY AND | ell-articulated. arly described. bropriately sele ll-implemented are implement e loop. evidence.) | d  | Studer Assess Assess Assess A sing No res Result | sment methods<br>le type of asses<br>sults are reporte<br>s are not clearly | s are not we<br>are not clea<br>are not apprare not well<br>sment meth<br>d.<br>y tied to clo | ell-articulated. rly described. ropriately selectedimplemented. lods predominates.         |             |
| impass  MA  X | ATERIAI Annual a Assessm Previous                        | on. Since the plan a   | dopts clear lea<br>for each progra  | rning goals and  | objectives :                                     | for each of its p   | rograms, fu   | to seeing its successfu<br>ture reports should rep<br>e MLS Certificate toge               | ort the     |
| Re            | viewers  | Name Department Phone Number e-mail  | Bradley My<br>Law School<br>7-2228<br>myers@law   | .und.edu   | 7-3140<br>deborah                                | n Worley<br>onal Leadership<br>worley@und.e                                 | du  | Shawn McHale  ***********************************  | -<br>-<br>- |
|               | ion 1:<br>ing Key:<br>Y                                  | reviewed and   | ne appropriatel recognizing   | ly and well (beathat assessment                          | ring in mir                                      | nd the kind of p  | orogram(s)  |  |             |
|               | Ç  |  | s action or pro   | collected in othe<br>ogress is apparent<br>oriately done |  | , evidence is la  | cking that  |  |             |

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

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2014-2015 (Academic Year)

| <u>(</u>   | GRADUATE PR   | OGRAM   | <u>IS</u>   |  |  |  |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| DEPARTMENT Medical Laboratory Science  | ence  |   |   |  | DATE   | April *, 2016  |
| PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW   | MLS Certificate   |   |   |  |  |  |
| COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTION   | ING REVIEW  | Bradley M   | Iyers,  | Debora   | h Worley   | & Shawn McHale   |
| <ul> <li>STUDENT LEARNING GOALS</li> <li>Were any goals referenced?</li> <li>If so, were goals well-articulated?</li> <li>Do goals address student learning?</li> </ul> Comments: The Department revised its assess assessment goals, assessment strategies and Department's degree and certificate program a bachelor's degree, the plan identifies five lesseven associated objectives. (These goals and goals the plan identifies courses in which ass assessment, who has responsibility for the ast triggered the revision to the assessment plan inputs to outputs. In addition to updating the different tools used to gather assessment data | also contains separates. For the MLS Certs earning goals, with I dobjectives are the so sessment can take play esessment and how the was changes in the New Department's missice. | e learning ificate, which ificate, which if it is associate in the metion assessment AACLS acception. | and ted<br>ch is fo<br>d object<br>the B.S<br>hod for<br>at will t<br>credita | es depo<br>aching<br>or stude<br>ctives a<br>l. in ML<br>r assess<br>be docu | goals for<br>nts who h<br>nd two te<br>S). For e<br>ment, the<br>umented.<br>undards t | each of the have already completed haching goals, with ach of the learning frequency of The driving factor that hat shifted the focus on |
| 2. ASSESSMENT METHODS  |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| Were any specific assessment methods refere  | enced?  | X   | Yes   |  | No   | Qualified Y/N  |
| <ul> <li>If so, were specifically chosen asses<br/>appropriately aligned with individual</li> </ul>  |   |   | Yes   | X  | No _   | Qualified Y/N  |
| <ul> <li>Were both direct and indirect assess<br/>components of a "multiple measures</li> </ul>  |   | s   | Yes   | <u>X</u>   | No _   | Qualified Y/N  |
| Comments: The Department reports that it of Department reports that it used feedback from The Department also reports that it "focused national board of certification entry-level exaconclude that all its graduates "are performing assessment activity for the academic year worlden.   | m the student exit eval<br>l on reviewing the per<br>amination." No data<br>ing well on the nation  | luation, it of<br>formance of<br>from that ro<br>al board of  | only re<br>of our r<br>eview v<br>f certifi                                   | ports th<br>recent g<br>was rep<br>ication.                                  | ie respon<br>graduates<br>orted, bu<br>It should                                       | ses to one question.<br>on our profession's<br>t the Department did<br>l be noted that   |
| 3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS  |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| Were any assessment results reported?  |   | X   | Yes   |  | No _   | Qualified Y/N  |

| •                           | • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals?  |  | Yes   | <u>X</u>                              | No<br>-  |   | Qualified Y/N   |
|-----------------------------|---|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| •                           | • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?   |  | Yes   | X                                     | No -   |   | Qualified Y/N   |
| •                           | • Were the results tied to goals of student learning?   | X  | Yes   |                                       | No   |   | Qualified Y/N   |
| (The "In g of the also chan | ments: The Department only reports the response of students in Department consolidated the data from its BS students with the general, I believe I was adequately prepared for MLS 470 levels 7 online students agreed with the statement that they felt prepares that it has "been working on reviewing the curriculum ges, implement over the last five years, are associated with an are immunology subpart of the ASCP MLS Board of Certification | ose in its le<br>l coursewe<br>pared for le<br>change we<br>increase t     | MLS coork?"6<br>MLS 4;<br>within it                         | ertific<br>2 of t<br>70 lev<br>ts cou | tate prophe 72 on the 72 on the 72 on the 12 of the 12 o | gram).<br>n-camp<br>sework<br>ut teach<br>Depart    | The question was: bus students and 7 The Department i immunology." The ment's graduates                     |
| 4.                          | CLOSING THE LOOP  |  |   |                                       |  |   |   |
| Were                        | e any actions taken?  | X  | Yes   |                                       | No   |   | Qualified Y/N   |
| •                           | • If so, were they based on assessment results?   |  | Yes   |                                       | No   | X   | Qualified Y/N   |
| •                           | • If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?   | X  | Yes   |                                       | No   |   | Qualified Y/N   |
| Com                         | ments:  |  |   |                                       |  |   |   |
| SUM                         | IMARY   |  | 4   | c                                     | 7  |   |   |
|                             | Strengths   |  | Are   | as jo                                 | r Impro  | vemen   | t   |
| X<br>X<br>X<br>X            | 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.  | Assessme<br>Assessme<br>Assessme<br>A single t<br>No results<br>Results ar | earning<br>nt met<br>nt met<br>nt met<br>ype of<br>s are re | goals hods hods hods asses porte      | s are not are not are not are not sment red.   | t well-a<br>clearly<br>approp<br>well-in<br>nethods | n place. narticulated. described. riately selected. nplemented. s predominates. g the loop. d to evidence.) |
| OVE                         | ERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:  |  |   |                                       |  |   |   |

The Department has adopted a comprehensive new assessment plan and the committee looks forward to seeing its successful implementation. Since the plan adopts clear learning goals and objectives for each of its programs, future reports should report the assessment activities separately for each program (though it may make sense to report the B.S. and the MLS Certificate together).

| X Annua X Asses X Previo | LS REVIEWED al assessment reportsment plan (as postous assessment rev (please describe) | ted)              |  |              |
|--------------------------|---|-------------------|--|--------------|
| Reviewers:               | Name  | Bradley Myers     | Deborah Worley   | Shawn McHale |
|                          | Department  | Law School        | Educational<br>Leadership  |              |
|                          | Phone Number  | 7-2228            | 7-3140   |              |
|                          | e-mail  | myers@law.und.edu | deborah.worley@un<br>d.edu   |              |
| ****                     | *******   | *********         | ***********  | *****        |
| Section 1:               | Y Section   | n 2: Q Section 3: | Q Section 4: Q   |              |
| Coding Key:              | :   |                   |  |              |
| Y =                      | yes, this is don<br>reviewed and  |                   | aring in mind the kind of program(s) at is a cyclical process, i.e., with her years) |              |
| Q =                      |   |                   | nt; however, evidence is lacking that  |              |
| N=                       |   |                   | , or it is not done in relationship to   |              |

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2014-2015 (Academic Year)

| DEPARTMENT   | Medical Laboratory Scien   | nce  |                           |                       |                          | _ DATE                      | April *, 2016                        |  |
|--|--|--|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| PROGRAM(S) C   | OVERED IN REVIEW   | Chemistry/Urinalysis Categorical Certificate |                           |                       |                          |                             |                                      |  |
| COMMITTEE M  | IEMBER(S) CONDUCTIN  | NG REVIEW                                    | Bradley N                 | Ayers,                | Deborah W                | orley & Sl                  | nawn McHale                          |  |
| 1. STUDENT L   | EARNING GOALS  |  |                           |                       |                          |                             |                                      |  |
| Were any   | goals referenced?  |  | X                         | Yes                   |                          | No                          | Qualified Y/N                        |  |
| -  | e goals well-articulated?  |  | X                         | Yes                   |                          | No                          | Qualified Y/N                        |  |
|  | address student learning?  |  | X                         | Yes                   |                          | No                          | Qualified Y/N                        |  |
| responsibility for t<br>the assessment pla<br>addition to updatii<br>assessment data b | in which assessment can take the assessment and how the control was changes in the NAAC and the Department's mission by faculty. | assessment will be o<br>LS accreditation st  | documented<br>andards tha | l. The a<br>at shifte | lriving facted the focus | or that trig<br>s on inputs | gered the revision to to outputs. In |  |
|  | assessment methods referen   | aced?  | X                         | Yes                   |                          | No                          | Qualified Y/N                        |  |
| • If so, wer   | re specifically chosen assessately aligned with individual   | ment methods                                 |                           | Yes                   | X                        | No                          | Qualified Y/N                        |  |
|  | h direct and indirect assessm<br>nts of a "multiple measures"  |  |                           | Yes                   | X                        | No                          | Qualified Y/N                        |  |
| Department repor   | Department reports that it conts results from only one asse  |  |                           |                       |                          |                             |                                      |  |
| Were any assessm   | ent results reported?  |  | X                         | Yes                   |                          | No                          | Qualified Y/N                        |  |
| • If so, wer   | re the results clear in terms of   |  |                           | Yes                   | X                        | No _                        | Qualified Y/N                        |  |
| • If so, wer   | re the results clear in terms of improvement?  |  | ·                         | Yes                   | X                        | No                          | Qualified Y/N                        |  |
| • Were the   | results tied to goals of stude   | ent learning?                                |                           | Yes                   | X                        | No                          | Qualified Y/N                        |  |

|   | partment reports that six graduates took porting of its graduates because the ageing performance.)   |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
|   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. CLOSING TH   | E LOOP   |  |  |  |  |
| Were any actions tal  | ken?   | X  | Yes  | No   | Qualified Y/N  |
| • If so, were   | they based on assessment results?  |  | Yes  | No X   | Qualified Y/N  |
|   | rricular or other improvements/changes<br>ment results directly address goals for s  |  | Yes  | No   | Qualified Y/N  |
|   | partment reports that it has changed son<br>has been added to courses in the Chemi   |  |  |  |  |
| SUMMARY   | Strengths  |  | Areas fo   | or Improvement   | ţ.   |
| X Student learni X Assessment n X Assessment n Assessment n Direct and inc Results are re Results are tic | in for assessment is in place. ing goals are well-articulated. nethods are clearly described. nethods are appropriately selected. nethods are well-implemented. lirect methods are implemented. ported. ed to closing the loop. king is tied to evidence.) | Assessme Assessme Assessme Assessme A single t No result: Results as | earning goals<br>ent methods are<br>ent methods are<br>ent methods are<br>type of assess<br>are reported<br>re not clearly | sessment is in plare not well-artine not clearly determine not appropriate not well-implement methods proceed to closing the ot directly tied to | culated. scribed. tely selected. emented. redominates. |
| The Department has implementation. Sin  | adopted a comprehensive new assessment the plan adopts clear learning goals a lities separately for each program.  | ent plan and the c   |  |  |  |
|   | sment report<br>lan (as posted)<br>ssment review   |  |  |  |  |

| Shawn McHale   |
|--|
| rship  |
| <u>-</u>   |
| nd.edu   |
| ********  Q  program(s) i.e., with acking that tionship to |
|  |

## Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2014-2015 (Academic Year)

| <u>GRADUA</u>   | TE PROGRAM            | <u>1S</u> |                |              |               |
|---|-----------------------|-----------|----------------|--------------|---------------|
| DEPARTMENT Medical Laboratory Science   |                       |           |                | DATE         | April *, 2016 |
| PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Hematolo   | gy/Hemostasis Cate    | gorica    | Certificate    |              |               |
| COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVI   | E <b>W</b> Bradley M  | Myers,    | Deborah Wo     | rley & Shav  | wn McHale     |
| 1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS   |                       |           |                |              |               |
| <ul><li>STUDENT LEARNING GOALS</li><li>Were any goals referenced?</li></ul>   | v                     | Yes       |                | No           | Qualified Y/N |
| <ul><li> Were any goals referenced?</li><li> If so, were goals well-articulated?</li></ul>  | $\frac{X}{X}$         | Yes       |                | No —         | Qualified Y/N |
| <ul> <li>Do goals address student learning?</li> </ul>  | X                     | Yes       |                | No _         | Qualified Y/N |
| responsibility for the assessment and how the assessment the assessment plan was changes in the NAACLS accreding addition to updating the Department's mission, philosophassessment data by faculty.  2. ASSESSMENT METHODS | itation standards the | at shift  | ed the focus o | on inputs to | outputs. In   |
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced?  | X                     | Yes       |                | No           | Qualified Y/N |
| <ul> <li>If so, were specifically chosen assessment meth-<br/>appropriately aligned with individual goals?</li> </ul>   | ods                   | Yes       | X              | No _         | Qualified Y/N |
| Were both direct and indirect assessment metho<br>components of a "multiple measures" approach"   |                       | Yes       | X              | No _         | Qualified Y/N |
| <b>Comments:</b> The Department reports that it collected and Department reports results from only one assessment me  |                       |           |                |              |               |
| 3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS   |                       |           |                |              |               |
| Were any assessment results reported?   | X                     | Yes       |                | No           | Qualified Y/N |
| <ul> <li>If so, were the results clear in terms of how they<br/>specifically affirm achievement of goals?</li> </ul>  |                       | Yes       | X              | No           | Qualified Y/N |
| <ul> <li>If so, were the results clear in terms of how they<br/>need for improvement?</li> </ul>  | indicate              | Yes       | X              | No _         | Qualified Y/N |

| • Were the results tied to goals of student learning?  |   | Yes X   | No No  | Qualified Y/N  |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| Comments: The Department reports that five graduates took the is based on the self-reporting of its graduates because the agentinformation regarding performance.)   |   |   |  |  |
| 4. CLOSING THE LOOP  |   |   |  |  |
| Were any actions taken?  | X   | Yes   | No   | Qualified Y/N  |
| • If so, were they based on assessment results?  |   | Yes   | No   | X Qualified Y/N  |
| <ul> <li>If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes are<br/>from assessment results directly address goals for stud<br/>learning?</li> </ul>   |   | Yes   | No   | Qualified Y/N  |
| Comments: The Department reports that it has changed some<br>Body Fluid Analysis has been added to courses in the Hematol  |   |   |  |  |
| SUMMARY Strengths  |   | Area  | s for Improveme  | nt   |
| X A specific plan for assessment is in place. X Student learning goals are well-articulated. X Assessment methods are clearly described. X 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.) | Assessme Assessme Assessme Assessme A single t No result Results as | earning go<br>ent method<br>ent method<br>ent method<br>type of ass<br>s are report<br>re not clear | assessment is in als are not well-a als are not clearly als are not approprise are not well-im essment methods ted.  The tied to closing is not directly tied. | rticulated. described. iately selected. plemented. predominates. |
| OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:  The Department has adopted a comprehensive new assessment implementation. Since the plan adopts clear learning goals and the assessment activities separately for each program.  |   |   |  |  |
| MATERIALS REVIEWED  X Annual assessment report  X Assessment plan (as posted)  X Previous assessment review  |   |   |  |  |

| Other       | (please describe)  |   |                                   |       |  |  |
|-------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|-------|--|--|
| Reviewers:  | viewers: Name Bradley Myers Deborah Worley Department Law School Educational Leadership Phone Number 7-2228 7-3140 e-mail myers@law.und.edu deborah.worley@und.edu |   |                                   |       |  |  |
| ****        |  |   | *********                         | ***** |  |  |
| Section 1:  | Y Sectio   | n 2: Q Section 3: Q   | Section 4: Q                      |       |  |  |
| Coding Key: |  |   |                                   |       |  |  |
| Y =         | reviewed and   | e appropriately and well (bearing<br>recognizing that assessment is<br>s of data to be collected in other y | a cyclical process, i.e., with    |       |  |  |
| Q =         | qualified yes as   | s action or progress is apparent; h   | owever, evidence is lacking that  |       |  |  |
|             |  | ely and appropriately done  |                                   |       |  |  |
| N=          | no, it is unclea   | r whether it was done at all, or  | it is not done in relationship to |       |  |  |

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2014 - 2015

## **UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

| DEPARTMENT  | Medical Laboratory Science  | ce  |                                    |                     | DATI   | E April *, 2016  |
|---|---|---|------------------------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| PROGRAM(S) C  | COVERED IN REVIEWH  | Histotechniciar                                 | n Certificate                      |                     |  |  |
| COMMITTEE M<br>REVIEW   | MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING  | G -   | Bradley Myers                      | , Debor             | ah Worley & Sh                                 | awn McHale   |
| 1. STUDENT L  | EARNING GOALS   |   |                                    |                     |  |  |
| <ul> <li>Were any</li> </ul>                                      | goals referenced?   |   | X                                  | Yes                 | No   | Qualified Y/N  |
| • If so, wer  | e goals well-articulated?   |   | X                                  | Yes                 | No   | Qualified Y/N  |
| • Do goals  | address student learning?   |   | X                                  | Yes                 | No   | Qualified Y/N  |
| driving factor that<br>focus on inputs to<br>different tools used | triggered the revision to the a outputs. In addition to updation to gather assessment data by | assessment pla<br>ing the Departi<br>y faculty. | n was changes i<br>ment's mission, | n the N.<br>philoso | AACLS accredit<br>phy and learnin <sub>s</sub> |  |
|   | gram goals, please also consident<br>parentheses). Identify UND/Es                            |   |                                    |                     |  |  |
|   | ommunication – written or oral  |   | =                                  |                     |  | = = =  |
|   | inking and reasoning – critical   |   |                                    |                     |  |  |
| 3. Th   | inking and reasoning – creativ  |   |                                    |                     |  |  |
|   | inking and reasoning – quanti   |   |                                    |                     |  |  |
|   | formation literacy ("be able to   |   |                                    |                     |  | cal use")  |
|   | versity ("demonstrate understa<br>felong learning ("commit then                               |   |                                    | it under            | standing")                                     |  |
|   | rvice/citizenship ("share respo   |   |                                    | ınities a           | and for the world                              | 1")  |
|   | ling program goals and alignn<br>to have specifically included in                             |   |                                    |                     |  | Some of the identified learning of the program of study. |
| 2. ASSESSMEN  | NT METHODS  |   |                                    |                     |  |  |
| Were any specific   | assessment methods reference  | ed?   | X                                  | Yes                 | No   | Qualified Y/N  |
|   | re specifically chosen assessmentely aligned with individual g                                |   |                                    | 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 Department reports that it collected and reviewed data reports results from only one assessment method: the ASCP HT Certificat  |  |   | f its led  | arning g  | oals. However, the Department  |
| 3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS   |  |   |  |   |  |
| Were any assessment results reported?   | X  | Yes   |  | No  | Qualified Y/N  |
| <ul> <li>If so, were the results clear in terms of how they<br/>specifically affirm achievement of goals?</li> </ul>  |  | Yes   | X  | No No   | Qualified Y/N  |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?   |  | Yes   | X  | _ No  | Qualified Y/N  |
| • Were the results tied to goals of student learning?   |  | Yes   | X  | No  | Qualified Y/N  |
| In addition to program goals, some assessment results may be applicable to those results which are applicable to institutional/Essential Studies goal ad below.  1. Communication – written or oral ("able to write and some some some some some some some some | speak is ellectuatellect ply en for end use arning' ir com | ment. In various ally cually cually compirica ffective that united amount in the compirity of the compirity | For in ous set arious reative I data. The efficient and the set an | ttings wi<br>ctings wi<br>c; analyz<br>e"; explo<br>analyz<br>cient, an<br>anding | items, please describe findings ith a sense of purpose/audience" te, synthesize, evaluate) ore, discover, engage) te graphical information") the dethical use")  world") |
| Comments regarding results and the application of results to programm  4. CLOSING THE LOOP  | auc, u   | asmun   | ionai,   | ana Ess   | ennai Suaies goais.  |
| Were any actions taken?   | X  | Yes   |  | No  | Qualified Y/N  |
| <ul><li>If so, were they based on assessment results?</li></ul>   |  | Yes   |  | No  | X Qualified Y/N  |
| • If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?   | <u>X</u>   | Yes   |  | _ No  | Qualified Y/N  |

Comments: The Department reports that it has changed its admissions criteria to require incoming students to have at least an Associate's degree before entering the program. This change was in response to revised accreditation standards, however, not do to assessment results. The Department has also changed the content of a number of its courses to include a greater focus on problem solving skills. This was in response to the performance of graduates on the national board certification examinations, and feedback from the HT Advisory Committee (which is composed of current students, alumni, clinical affiliates, faculty and employers.

### **SUMMARY**

|  | Strengt  | tns   | Areas for Improvement  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| X Student X Assessn X Assessn Assessn Direct a Results Results | fic plan for assessment learning goals are we nent methods are apprent methods are we nent methods are we nent methods are we not indirect methods are reported.  are tied to closing the on-making is tied to | vell-articulated. varly described. propriately selected. varly described. propriately selected. vare implemented. vare implemented. | No specific plan for assessment Student learning goals are not assessment methods are not assessment methods are not assessment methods are not a single type of assessment round No results are reported.  Results are not clearly tied to (Decision-making is not direction) | t well-articulated. clearly described. appropriately selected. well-implemented. methods predominates. |  |  |  |  |  |
| The Departn implementat  | nent has adopted a c   | adopts clear learning goals and   | plan and the committee looks forvolectives for each of its programs  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| X Annual X Assessn X Previous                                  | LS REVIEWED assessment report nent plan (as posted) s assessment review blease describe)   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Daviarram  | Nama   | Duadlas Majora  | Dahamah Wamlay   | Chown Mollolo  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reviewers  | Name<br>Department   | Bradley Myers Law School  | Deborah Worley Educational Leadership  | Shawn McHale   |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Phone Number   | 7-2228  | 7-3140   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | e-mail   | myers@law.und.edu   | deborah.worley@und.edu   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **   |  |   | *********  | ******   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Section 1:   | Y Section  | on 2: Q Section 3:  | Q Section 4: Q   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Coding Key:  | reviewed and   |   | aring in mind the kind of program  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (  | Q = qualified yes a  |   | nt; however, evidence is lacking the   | hat  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |   | , or it is not done in relationship  | to   |  |  |  |  |  |

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2014-2015 (Academic Year)

| DEPARTMENT  | Medical Laboratory Sci  | ence  |                           |                       |                          | DATE                           | April *, 2016                         |
|---|---|---|---------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| PROGRAM(S) Co   | OVERED IN REVIEW  | Immunohematolog                                 | y Categorio               | cal Cer               | tificate                 |                                |                                       |
| COMMITTEE M   | EMBER(S) CONDUCT  | ING REVIEW                                      | Bradley N                 | Ayers,                | Deborah                  | Worley & S                     | hawn McHale                           |
| 1. STUDENT L  | EARNING GOALS   |   |                           |                       |                          |                                |                                       |
| Were any  | goals referenced?   |   | X                         | Yes                   |                          | No                             | Qualified Y/N                         |
|   | e goals well-articulated?   |   | X                         | Yes                   |                          | No _                           | Qualified Y/N                         |
|   | address student learning?   |   | X                         | Yes                   |                          | No _                           | Qualified Y/N                         |
| responsibility for the assessment plan<br>addition to updatin<br>assessment data by | n which assessment can ta<br>he assessment and how the<br>n was changes in the NAA<br>og the Department's missic<br>of faculty. | e assessment will be a<br>CLS accreditation sta | locumented<br>andards the | l. The a<br>at shifte | lriving fa<br>ed the foc | ctor that trig<br>us on inputs | ggered the revision to to outputs. In |
|   | assessment methods refere   | enced?  |                           | Yes                   | X                        | No                             | Qualified Y/N                         |
| • If so, were   | e specifically chosen asses<br>tely aligned with individua  | sment methods                                   |                           | Yes                   | X                        | No _                           | Qualified Y/N                         |
| Were both   | n direct and indirect assess<br>ats of a "multiple measures   | ment methods used a                             | .s                        | Yes                   | X                        | No                             | Qualified Y/N                         |
|   | igh the Department report.<br>y Categorical Certification   |   | ee of the Lea             | arning                | Goals, it                | had no stud                    | ents who took the                     |
| 3. ASSESSMEN  | T RESULTS   |   |                           |                       |                          |                                |                                       |
| Were any assessme   | ent results reported?   |   |                           | Yes                   | X                        | No                             | Qualified Y/N                         |
|   | e the results clear in terms<br>ly affirm achievement of g  |   |                           | Yes                   | X                        | No                             | Qualified Y/N                         |
|   | e the results clear in terms mprovement?  | of how they indicate                            |                           | Yes                   | X                        | No                             | Qualified Y/N                         |
| • Were the  | results tied to goals of stud   | dent learning?                                  |                           | Yes                   | X                        | No                             | Qualified Y/N                         |

| 4. CLOSI   | NG THE LOOF  | •   |            |                        |               |                 |
|--|--|---|------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Were any ac  | tions taken?   |   | X          | Yes                    | No            | Qualified Y/N   |
| • If s   | o, were they base  | ed on assessment results?   |            | Yes                    | No            | X Qualified Y/N |
| froi   |  | or other improvements/changes arising ults directly address goals for student                         |            | Yes                    | No            | Qualified Y/N   |
| Comments:  | The Department   | reports that it has changed some of th  | ie courses | in the progr           | ram of study. |                 |
| SUMMARY  |  |   |            |                        |               |                 |
|  | Stren  | egths   |            | Areas                  | for Improveme | ent             |
| XA specific plan for assessment is in place.No specific plan for assessment is in place.XStudent learning goals are well-articulated.Student learning goals are not well-articulated.XAssessment methods are clearly described.Assessment methods are not clearly described.XAssessment 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.) |  |   |            |                        |               |                 |
| implementat  | ion. Since the pla   | a comprehensive new assessment pla<br>an adopts clear learning goals and objurately for each program. |            |                        |               |                 |
| X         Annual           X         Asses           X         Previous  | LS REVIEWED<br>al assessment rep<br>sment plan (as po<br>ous assessment re<br>(please describe | oort<br>osted)<br>eview   |            |                        |               |                 |
| Reviewers:   | Name<br>Department   | Bradley Myers Law School  | Deborah '  | Worley<br>nal Leadersh | ip            | Shawn McHale    |

Comments:

|                    | Phone Number e-mail | 7-2228<br>myers@law.und.edu  | 7-3140<br>deborah.worley@ | und.edu      |
|--------------------|---------------------|--|---------------------------|--------------|
| *****              | ******              | *********  | ********                  | ********     |
| Section 1: Y       | Section             | n 2: N Section 3:  | N Section 4:              | Q            |
| Coding Key:<br>Y = | reviewed and        | e appropriately and well (beari<br>recognizing that assessment<br>s of data to be collected in other | is a cyclical process     | 1 0 , ,      |
| Q =                | qualified yes as    | action or progress is apparent<br>ly and appropriately done  | •                         | lacking that |
| N=                 |                     | r whether it was done at all,  | or it is not done in rel  | ationship to |

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2014-2015 (Academic Year)

| DEPARTMENT Medical Laboratory Science  |                                  |                   |                      | DATE                           | April *, 2016 |
|--|----------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|
| PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW M.S. in Medical I   | Laboratory So                    | cience            |                      |                                |               |
| COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW  | Bradley M                        | Iyers,            | Deborah              | Worley & Sha                   | awn McHale    |
| 1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS  |                                  |                   |                      |                                |               |
| <ul> <li>Were any goals referenced?</li> </ul>   | X                                | Yes               |                      | No                             | Qualified Y/N |
| • If so, were goals well-articulated?  | X                                | Yes               |                      | No                             | Qualified Y/N |
| <ul> <li>Do goals address student learning?</li> </ul>   | X                                | Yes               |                      | No                             | Qualified Y/N |
| place, the method for assessment, the frequency of assessment, will be documented. The driving factor that triggered the revisio accreditation standards that shifted the focus on inputs to output and learning goal's, it created several different tools used to gat  2. ASSESSMENT METHODS | n to the asses<br>ts. In additio | ssment<br>n to up | plan wa<br>odating t | s changes in t<br>he Departmen | he NAACLS     |
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced?   | X                                | Yes               |                      | No                             | Qualified Y/N |
| <ul> <li>If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods<br/>appropriately aligned with individual goals?</li> </ul>  |                                  | Yes               | X                    | No                             | Qualified Y/N |
| <ul> <li>Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used<br/>components of a "multiple measures" approach?</li> </ul>  | as                               | Yes               | X                    | No                             | Qualified Y/N |
| <b>Comments:</b> The Department reports that it collected and review "evaluation of student performance on graduate comprehensive 524."  |                                  |                   |                      |                                |               |
| 3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS  |                                  |                   |                      |                                |               |
| Were any assessment results reported?  |                                  | Yes               | X                    | No                             | Qualified Y/N |
| <ul> <li>If so, were the results clear in terms of how they<br/>specifically affirm achievement of goals?</li> </ul>   |                                  | Yes               | X                    | No                             | Qualified Y/N |
| <ul> <li>If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicat<br/>need for improvement?</li> </ul>   |                                  | Yes               | X                    | No                             | Qualified Y/N |
| • Were the results tied to goals of student learning?  |                                  | Yes               | X                    | No                             | Qualified Y/N |

Comments: The Department did not report any results.

| 4. | <b>CLOSING</b> | THE LOOP |
|----|----------------|----------|
|    | CECDETIO       |          |

| Were any actions taken?   | X | Yes | No |   | Qualified Y/N |
|---|---|-----|----|---|---------------|
| • If so, were they based on assessment results?   |   | Yes | No | X | Qualified Y/N |
| • If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning? | X | Yes | No |   | Qualified Y/N |

Comments: The Department began implementation of a new curriculum for the M.S. starting in the fall of 1995. Courses were restructured to focus on strengthening the professional communication skills of graduate students. The Department also added a new Foundational course that focuses on the different skills needed to be an educator, consultant, or manager in medical laboratory science. The Department has also revised its comprehensive examination process and designated a faculty member to serve as graduate program coordinator. The changes were based on the performance of recent graduates on their written comprehensive exams. recent graduate feedback that called for an increased program oversight and organization. The Department has created a new survey tool that can gather additional information about student performance at different checkpoints in their program of study.

#### **SUMMARY**

#### Strengths

#### Areas for Improvement

| $\mathbf{X}$ | A specific plan for assessment is in place.    | No specific plan for assessment is in place.       |
|--------------|--|--|
| X            | Student learning goals are well-articulated.   | Student learning goals are not well-articulated.   |
| X            | Assessment methods are clearly described.      | Assessment methods are not clearly described.      |
| X            | 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 predominate    |
|              | 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 has adopted a comprehensive new assessment plan and the committee looks forward to seeing its successful implementation. Since the plan adopts clear learning goals and objectives for each of its programs, future reports should report the assessment activities separately for each program.

#### MATERIALS REVIEWED

- X Annual assessment report
- X Assessment plan (as posted)

| X Previo                 | ous assessment rev   | iew   |  |              |  |  |  |
|--------------------------|--|---|--|--------------|--|--|--|
| Other                    | (please describe)  |   |  |              |  |  |  |
|                          |  |   |  |              |  |  |  |
| Reviewers:               | Name   | Bradley Myers   | Deborah Worley                         | Shawn McHale |  |  |  |
|                          | Department   | Law School  | Educational Leadership                 | <del></del>  |  |  |  |
|                          | Phone Number   | <u> </u>  | 7-3140                                 |              |  |  |  |
|                          | e-mail   | myers@law.und.edu   | deborah.worley@und.edu                 |              |  |  |  |
| Section 1: _ Coding Key: |  | n 2: Q Section 3:   | N Section 4: Q                         | _            |  |  |  |
|                          | 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 =                      | •  | s action or progress is appared<br>ely and appropriately done | nt; however, evidence is lacking that  | t            |  |  |  |
| N=                       | -  | r whether it was done at all,                                 | , or it is not done in relationship to | )            |  |  |  |

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2014-2015 (Academic Year)

| DEPARTMENT   | Medical Laboratory Scientific Medical Laboratory  | ence   |                               |                     |                        | DATE                                  | April *, 2016                          |
|--|---|--|-------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| PROGRAM(S) CO  | OVERED IN REVIEW  | Microbiology Cate                              | egorical Cer                  | tificate            | e                      |                                       |  |
| COMMITTEE M  | EMBER(S) CONDUCTI   | ING REVIEW                                     | Bradley N                     | /Jyers,             | Deboral                | n Worley & Sh                         | awn McHale                             |
| 1. STUDENT LI  | EARNING GOALS   |  |                               |                     |                        |                                       |  |
| Were any   | goals referenced?   |  | X                             | Yes                 |                        | No                                    | Qualified Y/N                          |
| -  | e goals well-articulated?   |  | X                             | Yes                 | -                      | No                                    | Qualified Y/N                          |
| • Do goals a   | address student learning?   |  | X                             | Yes                 |                        | No                                    | Qualified Y/N                          |
| assessment and hov<br>was changes in the<br>Department's missi<br>faculty. | at can take place, the meth<br>w the assessment will be do<br>NAACLS accreditation sta<br>ion, philosophy and learni<br>T METHODS | ocumented. The drivi<br>andards that shifted i | ing factor th<br>the focus or | hat trig<br>1 input | ggered ti<br>s to outp | he revision to to<br>outs. In additio | the assessment plan on to updating the |
| Were any specific a  | assessment methods refere   | enced?   | X                             | Yes                 |                        | No                                    | Qualified Y/N                          |
| • If so, were  | e specifically chosen asses<br>ely aligned with individua   | sment methods                                  |                               | Yes                 | X                      | No                                    | Qualified Y/N                          |
|  | direct and indirect assess<br>tts of a "multiple measures   |  | ns                            | Yes                 | X                      | No                                    | Qualified Y/N                          |
|  | epartment reports that it co<br>s results from only one ass   |  |                               |                     |                        |                                       |  |
| 3. ASSESSMEN   | T RESULTS   |  |                               |                     |                        |                                       |  |
| Were any assessme  | ent results reported?   |  | X                             | Yes                 |                        | No                                    | Qualified Y/N                          |
|  | e the results clear in terms<br>y affirm achievement of g   |  |                               | Yes                 | X                      | No                                    | Qualified Y/N                          |
|  | e the results clear in terms mprovement?  | of how they indicate                           |                               | Yes                 | X                      | No                                    | Qualified Y/N                          |
| • Were the i   | results tied to goals of stud   | lent learning?                                 |                               | Yes                 | X                      | No                                    | Qualified Y/N                          |

|   | elf-reporting of<br>egarding perforn  | ts graduates because the ago<br>ance.)                       | ency administe   | ring the ex   | xam does not prov  | vide them with detailed  |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|--|
|   |   |  |  |   |  |  |
| 4. CLOSIN   | G THE LOOP  |  |  |   |  |  |
| Were any action   | ons taken?  |  | 2  | X Yes   | No   | Qualified Y/N  |
| • If so,  | were they based   | on assessment results?                                       | _  | Yes   | No   | X Qualified Y/N  |
|   | assessment resu   | other improvements/changes<br>tts directly address goals for |  | Yes   | No   | Qualified Y/N  |
| Comments: Ti  | he Department r   | eports that it has changed so                                | me of the cour   | ses in the  | program of study.  |  |
| SUMMARY   | Streng  | ths  |  | $\boldsymbol{A}$  | reas for Improve   | ment   |
| X Student X Assess X Assesss Assesss Direct a Results Results (Decision  OVERALL S  The Departme implementation | t learning goals a<br>ment methods ar<br>ment methods ar<br>ment methods ar<br>ment indirect method<br>are reported.<br>are tied to closic<br>con-making is tie<br>EUMMARY AN<br>ent has adopted as<br>on. Since the plan |  | Assess Assess Assess Assess A sing No res Result (Deci | at learning<br>sment meth<br>sment meth<br>sment meth<br>le type of<br>sults are re<br>s are not c<br>sion-making | hods are not well-<br>assessment metho<br>ported.<br>learly tied to clos<br>ng is not directly | ll-articulated. lly described. opriately selected. implemented. ods predominates. ing the loop. tied to evidence.) |
| X         Annual           X         Assessr           X         Previous                                       | S REVIEWED assessment reponent plan (as possessment revenues assessment revenues describe)  | sted)  |  |   |  |  |
| Reviewers:  | Name  | Bradley Myers  | Debor  | ah Worley   | 7  | Shawn McHale   |

Comments: The Department reports that two graduates took the exam during the year and that both passed. (The pass rate is

|  |  | Department<br>Phone Number<br>e-mail   |  | Law School 7-2228 myers@law.und.edu |   | d.edu      | -<br>-<br>- | Educational Leadership 7-3140 deborah.worley@und.edu |            |   | ·<br>· |  | _ |
|--|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|---|------------|-------------|--|------------|---|--------|--|---|
| *****************************  |  |  |  |                                     |   |            |             |  |            |   |        |  |   |
| Section  | 1: _   | Y  | Section  | n 2:                                | Q | 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 =  |  |  |                                     |   |            |             |  |            |   |        |  |   |
|  |  | this is completely and appropriately done  |  |                                     |   |            |             |  |            |   |        |  |   |
|  | N=   | no, it is unclear whether it was done at all, or it is not done in relationship to |  |                                     |   |            |             |  |            |   |        |  |   |