

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

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Counselling **DATE** April 15, 2016

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW B.S. in Rehabilitation and Human Services

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Surojit Gupta & Casey Ozaki

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 Department has an assessment plan placed in October 15, 2012. The assessment plan has a well-defined mission statement, and six student learning goals, namely: (a) To develop the skills, knowledge, and values of students that will enable them to provide quality rehabilitation services, (b) To teach students to empower consumers in their development of personal and vocational resources and opportunities, (c) To prepare students to participate as an integral member of multidisciplinary networks providing services to consumers, (d) To help students develop a commitment to lifelong learning and professional growth, (e) To prepare students for graduate education in a variety of rehabilitation fields, and (f) To enable students to become informed citizens who are supportive of the full inclusion of people with disabilities in society.

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> </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> </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: RHS 493 (Senior Capstone Seminar – Fall 2014, Spring 2015, and Summer 2015) is an approved Essential Studies Capstone course, and ES advanced communication course.

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> </u> | Yes | <u> </u> | No | <u>x</u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |

Comments: The Department collects data from, (a) Students in Required Courses (it provides student's perspective of what they perceive to be their improvement in knowledge and skills in their required course work), (b) in Capstone course (RHS 493) (it provides Program Coordinator's perspective about the skills in the areas of oral and written communication and in their mastery of the professional literature in the field of rehabilitation and human services), and (c) in Rehabilitation Internships (it provides on-site internship supervisors perspective of how students improve over the course of their 400 h internships). Indirect assessment was used in all the cases with a 4-point scale (1- Very limited understanding of the topic, 2- some understanding of topic, 3 – moderate understanding of the topic, and 4 – a great deal of understanding of topic) or a 5-point scale. In addition, the data collection did not directly referenced the collection explicitly to six student learning goals referenced in Section 1 although it may be implicitly embedded in the data collection, but it is not clearly stated.

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: The Department reported the results of survey. Overall, the results indicated positive growth and students mastering the course content, for example while assessing RHS 250 (Contemporary Rehabilitation Issues – Spring 2015 semester) – the overall mean (N = 30) improved from 2.33 (beginning) to 3.67 (end) . Similarly, student performance in Senior Capstone Seminar RHS 493) showed positive results – the overall mean (N=16) during midterm and end were 2.99 and 4.54, respectively. On-site reviewer rating also showed remarkable improvement where mean (N=16) increased from 2.92 (midterm) to 3.58 (final).

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> </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> </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 results and the application of results to programmatic, institutional, and Essential Studies goals:

In the RHS 493 – students showed improvement in effective and high-quality communication from a mean of 3.26 (midterm) to 4.80 (end).

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 Department took corrective actions based on the assessment results. For example, 2014 assessment showed that RHS 455 (Rehabilitation Process) needed improvement in two areas (explaining the principles of independent living and applying these principles in various rehabilitation settings, and analyzing common therapeutic approaches used in the field) – the Department took the required remedial action by inviting guest speakers to the address above mentioned issues, and the assessment in 2015 showed improvement where the mean improved from 3.40 and 3.20 to 3.65 and 3.52 on the above mentioned two assessment issues. Similarly, the Department also reported that RHS 250 will need improvement in 2015 assessment, (a) how people with disabilities are affected with political processes, and (b) consumer involvement in rehabilitation. The department reported that in future it will take action by performing class presentations and inviting guest speakers who will emphasize on the above mentioned topics. The assessment committee is looking forward to these results. The department also mentioned that it will monitor productivity and independent component in the Rehabilitation Internship as the supervisor rating in these parameters showed lower scores, but the supervisors did not think it was a cause of major concern when compared with new employees trained at bachelor's level.

SUMMARY***Strengths******Areas for Improvement***

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

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Overall the Department has an excellent job in collecting the data. The committee is looking forward to seeing some direct methods to evaluate the student learning. In addition, the Department should make sure that they are addressing the student learning goals listed in the assessment plan when they are implementing the assessment methods. The assessment plan also stated that CORE, the Council on Rehabilitation Education, Inc. (<http://www.core-rehab.org/>) has recently begun accrediting undergraduate rehabilitation and disability studies education programs. No update was given on this in the assessment plan.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Annual assessment report
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment plan (as posted)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Previous assessment review
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe)

Reviewers	Name	Surojit Gupta	Casey Ozaki	
	Department	Mechanical Engineering	Teaching and Learning	
	Phone Number	7-1632	7-4256	
	e-mail	Surojit.gupta@engr.und.edu	Carolyn.ozaki@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