

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2014-15 (Academic Year)

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Nutrition and Dietetics DATE February 25, 2016

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Community Nutrition

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Joan Hawthorne and Deb Hanson

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----|---------------|----|---------------|---------------|
| • Were any goals referenced? | <u>X</u> | Yes | <u> </u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • If so, were goals well-articulated? | <u>X</u> | Yes | <u> </u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • Do goals address student learning? | <u>X</u> | Yes | <u> </u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |

Comments:

It appears that the assessment plan has been recently revisited and perhaps updated – which is a good practice. The goals are clear and those listed in the report are exactly as listed in the plan. All are framed in language designed to make them assessable.

In addition to program goals, please also consider UND's institutional and Essential Studies goals for student learning (shown in alignment within parentheses). Identify UND/Essential Studies goals which are similar to the referenced program goals.

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

Three goals are clearly aligned with those in the ES program. There are several others that may have some alignment, but it's hard to be certain without knowing more about how the goal is actually addressed in the program.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

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

Comments:

We can see the intended alignment by matching assessment method with the assessment plan and, in some cases, we can see the alignment directly in the assessment report. A variety of tools are used including surveys, self-evaluations, preceptor evaluations, an exam, a paper, and a needs assessment.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	<u>X</u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u> </u>	Qualified Y/N
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals?	<u>X</u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u> </u>	Qualified Y/N
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?	<u>X</u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u> </u>	Qualified Y/N
• Were the results tied to goals of student learning?	<u>X</u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u> </u>	Qualified Y/N

Comments:

In some cases, the data were not clearly linked back to specific learning outcomes but in many cases, the linkage between learning outcome, assessment method, and result/finding was very clear. It appeared to us that some of the results for specific learning outcomes were obtained through methods other than those specified in the plan – which is fine but may suggest a need to revisit (yet again) the plan and ensure that it reflects current practice.

In addition to program goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. Please identify those results which are applicable to institutional/Essential Studies goal achievement. For indicated items, please describe findings below.

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

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

Results indicate a reasonable level of achievement on four Essential Studies/Institutional goals (including the diversity goal, which is not clearly specified in the learning outcomes but data are provided). Faculty indicated that they see a need to improve student performance on the communication outcome.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken?	<u>X</u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u> </u>	Qualified Y/N
• If so, were they based on assessment results?	<u>X</u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u> </u>	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	<u> </u>	No	<u> </u>	Qualified Y/N

Comments:

Two specific loop-closing activities are described, one intended to address what faculty perceive as a deficiency in student performance on the communication outcomes, and one to reconsidering benchmarking levels in order to determine appropriateness. They note that having students routinely meet benchmarks can be an indication of program quality, but could also be an indication that the benchmark levels (or perhaps the assessment tools?) aren't demanding the appropriate level of rigor. The report also mentions "streamlining" the documentation process, which is usually a good thing, especially for a small department with multiple programs.

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:

The program faculty deserve to be commended for doing thoughtful assessment work, documenting fairly zealously, and summarizing clearly in the report. We note that this is one of the programs at UND that appears to have made progress on assessment since its previous review, and we are happy to see evidence of the quality work being done.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

- ☒ Annual assessment report
- ☒ Assessment plan (as posted)
- ☒ Previous assessment review
- ☐ Other (please describe)

Reviewers	Name	Joan Hawthorne	Deb Hanson	
	Department	Academic Affairs	Occupational Therapy	
	Phone Number	7-4684	7-2218	
	e-mail	Joan.hawthorne@und.ed u	Debra.hanson@und.edu	

Section 1: Y Section 2: Y 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)

Q = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that 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 student learning

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2014-15 (Academic Year)

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Nutrition and Dietetics DATE February 25, 2016

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Dietetics

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Joan Hawthorne and Deb Hanson

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----|---------------|----|---------------|---------------|
| • Were any goals referenced? | <u>X</u> | Yes | <u> </u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • If so, were goals well-articulated? | <u>X</u> | Yes | <u> </u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • Do goals address student learning? | <u>X</u> | Yes | <u> </u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |

Comments:

The report includes detailed goals and objectives, which were the same as the goals and objectives listed in the assessment plan. Since this is an accredited program, it appears likely that the specific language was developed to align with the expectations of the program accreditor.

In addition to program goals, please also consider UND's institutional and Essential Studies goals for student learning (shown in alignment within parentheses). Identify UND/Essential Studies goals which are similar to the referenced program goals.

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

The alignment with several institutional and or ES outcomes is quite clear (e.g., “communicate effectively, both orally and in writing...” “develop and evaluate...[to] accommodate the cultural diversity and health needs of various populations....”).

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

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

Comments:

Program faculty are committed to quite an array of methods, and the alignment of those methods with specific outcomes is clearly evident both in the plan and in the report. Both direct (e.g., Registration Examination for Dietiticians, preceptor evaluations, the therapeutic menu project) and indirect (self-evaluation). In some cases it's not possible to tell whether the tool allows data to be disaggregated for linkages with specific outcomes, but it's obvious that several of the tools do allow that disaggregation by outcome and, indeed, results are looked at in that way.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	<u>X</u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u> </u>	Qualified Y/N
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals?	<u>X</u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u> </u>	Qualified Y/N
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?	<u>X</u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u> </u>	Qualified Y/N
• Were the results tied to goals of student learning?	<u>X</u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u> </u>	Qualified Y/N

Comments:

Data points from a variety of tools and related to a variety of outcomes are included in the report, making it evident that faculty are collecting and analyzing assessment information on a regular basis. In some cases, the results are reported as clearly linked to the specific outcome ("11/12 (92%) received at least 2/3 for planning & implementing nutrition interventions on the major case study"). Benchmarks for a small number of outcomes are framed in letter grades (e.g., "at least 75% of students will attain at least a score of B (84%) on the ability to meet patient therapeutic nutrition needs..."), and, for those outcomes/benchmarks, results are reported in that way. Use of grades in assessment, whether as a benchmark or a measure, is usually discouraged because grades typically "measure" more than one thing (e.g., compliance with assignment rules – as well as content knowledge, writing quality, etc.) If the use of grades as a benchmark is not in some way a result of accreditor expectations, it may be worth considering other – potentially more focused – ways of measuring, reporting, and benchmarking (such as those used for your other learning outcomes). The service hours requirement is another benchmark that might be more appropriately be considered part of program evaluation (i.e., is the program successful in ensuring that students complete appropriate numbers of service hours?) rather than an assessment of student learning – although preceptor evaluations, potentially associated with those service hours, are clearly a direct measure and you do report them as such.

In addition to program goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. Please identify those results which are applicable to institutional/Essential Studies goal achievement. For indicated items, please describe findings below.

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

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

It's nice to see that you are able to report so much information – much of it also relevant for ES purposes – in a single year (obviously not required, but the reporting makes your efforts in this area evident). Except for the quantitative reasoning outcome, the report included evidence demonstrating a fairly high level of achievement on all ES/institutional outcomes with which program outcomes align.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken?	<u>X</u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u> </u>	Qualified Y/N
• If so, were they based on assessment results?	<u>X</u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u> </u>	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	<u> </u>	No	<u> </u>	Qualified Y/N

Comments:

The report provides two examples – including a high level of detail – about plans for improving communication skills students are able to demonstrate. There were also loop-closing discussions regarding the goal for nutrition care planning (for which they had data from before changes were made in an attempt to improve student learning that area, plus data from after the changes were implemented).

SUMMARY

Strengths

<u>X</u>	A specific plan for assessment is in place.
<u>X</u>	Student learning goals are well-articulated.
<u>X</u>	Assessment methods are clearly described.
<u>X</u>	Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
<u>X</u>	Assessment methods are well-implemented.
<u>X</u>	Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
<u>X</u>	Results are reported.
<u>X</u>	Results are tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

Areas for Improvement

<u> </u>	No specific plan for assessment is in place.
<u> </u>	Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
<u> </u>	Assessment methods are not clearly described.
<u> </u>	Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
<u> </u>	Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
<u> </u>	A single type of assessment methods predominates.
<u> </u>	No results are reported.
<u> </u>	Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

This report seems to demonstrate some real improvements from the one submitted three years ago – it's very nice to see the thoughtful work combined with the careful attention to reporting. There is mention of a new assessment plan to be created, and, if that has been done, it should be posted on UND's assessment plan website as soon as possible.

We did note that you are using many different methods – which seems to be working and is certainly fine. If it's becoming a burden to collect data from so many different sources, it should be possible to streamline and Joan Hawthorne (or one of UND's assessment consultants) would be happy to have a conversation with faculty about strategies for achieving that change.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

X Annual assessment report
X Assessment plan (as posted)
X Previous assessment review
_____ Other (please describe)

Reviewers	Name	<u>Joan Hawthorne</u>	<u>Deb Hanson</u>	<u> </u>
	Department	<u>Academic Affairs</u>	<u>Occupational Therapy</u>	<u> </u>
	Phone Number	<u>7-4684</u>	<u>7-2218</u>	<u> </u>
	e-mail	<u>Joan.hawthorne@und.ed</u>	<u>Debra.hanson@und.edu</u>	<u> </u>
		<u>u</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

Section 1: Y Section 2: Y 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)
Q = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that 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 student learning