

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

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

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Teaching & Learning (T&L) DATE March 10, 2016

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Undergraduate

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Casler, Askim-Lovseth, Appianing

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 2007 version of the Departmental Plan for Assessment identifies the student learning goals as: Possess the knowledge, skills and dispositions to work effectively in P-12 schools; use inquiry, experience and reflection to continually grow as a learner (Teacher as Learner (TaL)) and active agent of learning (Teacher as Active Agent of Learning (TAAL)), and an articulate visionary (Teacher as Articulate Visionary (TAV)). These general goals decomposed and mapped to Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) model core teaching standards. As such, these extensive and nuanced subgoals are well-articulated and measurable subjectively. However, it should be noted that while the student learning goals are well-articulated, the assessment plan available does not reflect, nor align with, the recent (2015) revision of the InTASC model.

The 2015 version of the InTASC model was obtained separately. This version reorders the standards as learner development, learner differences, learning environments, content knowledge, application of content, assessment, planning for instruction, instructional strategies, professional learning and ethical practice, and leadership and collaboration. The measurement rubric is changed to reflect student learning goals under the general categories of Educators as Learners (EL), Educators as Advocates (EA), and Educators as Practitioners (EP).

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>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> </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:

Though alignment is not necessarily precise, the following goals (as related to the 2015 InTASC model) are examples that can be generally related to the indicated Essential Studies goals:

- Goals 3.2, 4.2, 6.3, 8.5, and 8.6 relate to Communication
- Goals 2.2, 5.3, 6.2, 6.3, 7.2, and 9.2 relate to Critical Thinking
- Goals 5.3 8.5, and 8.6 relate to Creative Thinking
- Goals 6.2 and 6.3 may include Quantitative Reasoning
- Goals 3.4 and 5.1 relate to Information Literacy
- Goals 2.1, 2.2, and 4.3 relate to Diversity

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> </u>	Yes	<u>X</u>	No	<u> </u>	Qualified Y/N

Comments:

The assessment methods referenced include standards-based rubrics with data collected from Critical Tasks. Data are collected by course instructors using Critical Tasks rubrics to score tasks associated with their courses. These data are subjective, qualitative, and directly measured. No indirect, nor objective, quantitative performance data appear to be collected. As extensive as the rubric may be, the description of the method would benefit from greater clarity in precisely how and on what occasions these data are collected.

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:

Examples are provided with respect to Elementary Education, Early Childhood Development, and Middle/Secondary Education. Shortfalls are identified with respect to specific Critical Tasks. Not all Critical Tasks are reported, e.g., Lesson Planning was the reported Critical Task for Elementary Education. The Critical Tasks relate to specific student learning goals.

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> </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:

Some examples of application to the indicated Essential Studies goals are provided:

Assessment of the Elementary Education area revealed a desire for more instruction on classroom management (Communication).

The Early Childhood Development area revealed a weakness in lesson planning (Critical Thinking).

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? Yes No Q Qualified Y/N

Comments:

For the areas reported in 2015, corrective actions were taken and documented in response to assessment results. Examples include holding a retreat to discuss technology approaches, and identification of appropriate technology for P-3rd education. These corrective actions are directly related to identified student learning goals. That said, the form, substance, and implementation of these corrective actions was not clearly stated. It is clear that the assessment results were discussed but it is not clear what actual changes were made to the curriculum, etc.

SUMMARY

Strengths

- A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- 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.
- 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.
- X 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 substantial strength of the T&L undergraduate assessment program is the extensive and nuanced description of student learning goals. More clarity in the implementation, e.g., how measurements are taken, would be beneficial, at least for third-party reviewers. The most significant weakness is that the posted Assessment Plan does not incorporate the most current InTASC model. When that model is incorporated, some realignment of the student learning goals is anticipated.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

- X Annual assessment report
- X Assessment plan (as posted)
- X Previous assessment review (2013, 2014)
- X Other (please describe) (2015
InTASC model)

Reviewers	Name	<u>Jim Casler</u>	<u>Mary Askim-Lovseth</u>	<u>Joseph Appianing</u>
	Department	<u>Space Studies</u>	<u>Marketing</u>	<u>Student</u>
	Phone Number	<u>7-3462</u>	<u>777-2930</u>	<u>777-4377</u>
	e-mail	<u>casler@space.edu</u>	<u>maskim@business.und.edu</u>	<u>Joseph.appianing@und.edu</u>

Section 1: Y Section 2: Q 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 14-15 (Academic Year)

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Teaching & Learning

DATE 5/5/2016

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Early Childhood Education – M.S.; Elementary Education – M.Ed. & M.S.;
Reading Education – M.Ed. & M.S.; General Studies Education – M.S.

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Casler, Askim-Lovseth, Appianing

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:

Student learning goals are mapped to each of the 5 core propositions of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) and are well-articulated.

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> </u> | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |

Comments:

Achievement of student learning goals is assessed using instructional reports, the topic proposal, and the scholarly project or independent study. Four to five specific courses are identified from which are gathered instructional reports, which are used to assess goals 1 through 3. A rubric is provided. The topic proposal, and associated rubric, is used to assess goal 5. The scholarly project, and associated rubric, is used to assess goal 4. While multiple measures are used, these methods directly assess the candidate or their products. Indirect measures do not appear to be used. That said, the assessment plan is judged to be quite extensive and comprehensive in assessing student learning.

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:

Results are reported in terms of achievement of student learning goals within each of the specific programs. Shortfalls in specific goals are identified in a manner that guides development of corrective action plans. However, while means

provide an aggregated understanding of the status of a program measure, such a representation is incomplete because articulation of the mean without supporting information does not provide information on the number of students who met, exceeded, or failed expectations; especially when the data represented the inclusion of multiple scores for some of the candidates.

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:

Several action plans are identified to address shortfalls in achievement of specific learning goals. In some cases, the appropriate path forward was not yet apparent to the Department and studies are recommended. For example: “The lowest mean, 2.27, was for Goal 3.2. The elementary graduate faculty will identify a plan to strengthen learning about assessment.” In other cases, the courses of action were more clear and more definitively laid out. For example, “...continue to increase attention to assessment in T&L 530 ...A specific unit of study on assessing readers has been incorporated ...”

SUMMARY

Strengths

<u> </u>	A specific plan for assessment is in place.
<u> </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> </u>	Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
<u> </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> X </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:

The assessment program is well-planned and well-executed. If any suggestions are to be made, they would be to:

1. Consider incorporating some indirect methods of assessment
2. While the loop-closing activities appeared appropriate and well-founded, consider describing these with greater clarity.

Representing the data in other ways beyond simply indicating means would be beneficial in that it would enable an understanding of the percentage of students that are at each performance level.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

<u> X </u>	Annual assessment report
<u> X </u>	Assessment plan (as posted)
<u> </u>	Previous assessment review
<u> </u>	Other (please describe)

Reviewers:	Name	Jim Casler	Mary Askim-Lovseth	Joseph Appianing
	Department	<u>Space Studies</u>	<u>Marketing</u>	<u>Student</u>
	Phone Number	<u>7-3462</u>	<u>777-2930</u>	<u>777-4377</u>

e-mail	<u>casler@space.edu</u>	<u>maskim@business.u</u> <u>nd.edu</u>	<u>Joseph.appianing@und.edu</u>
--------	-------------------------	---	---------------------------------

Section 1: Y Section 2: Q 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 2014/2015 (Academic Year)

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Teaching & Learning

DATE 4/22/2016

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW College Teaching Graduate Certificate (CTC)

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Appianing, Askim-Lovseth, & Casler

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:

There are seven broad goals listed for students pursuing the college teaching certificate (see below). The goals are well-articulated and address student learning:

- i. *Gain knowledge about various pedagogical approaches*
- ii. *Experience and demonstrate effective teaching skills*
- iii. *Connect institutional and department missions, as well as disciplinary norms*
- iv. *Foster ethical behaviors and professional standards*
- v. *Understand the complexities of the academic profession*
- vi. *Identify emerging trends in college teaching excellence*
- vii. *Participate in professional forums as a means to enhance the knowledge and practice of effective college teaching during the period of the program and beyond.*

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> </u> | Yes | <u> </u> | No | <u>Q</u> | Qualified Y/N |

Comments:

The AY 2014/2015 assessment report lists a number of direct and indirect assessment methods by which the learning goals are assessed, as well as the relevant required courses through which the goals are met. Examples of the multiple assessment methods used in the CTC program include teaching demonstrations, assignments and projects, books and article reviews, class participation, writing reflection papers, and student surveys. The assessment methods selected appropriately align with the learning goals. Nonetheless, learning goals #3 and #7 have not yet been assessed and no specific explanation was given in the AY2014/2015 assessment report as regards to the appropriate time those goals would be assessed. However, AY2014/2015 assessment report provided explanation as to why those two goals have not been assessed as follows: “The two broad goals that have not been assessed will require consultation with all instructors in the certificate program, the T&L Department Chair, and the Dean of EHD over time. Once a larger number of program graduates have been in their positions for a period of time, assessment data will be more available than it is at the current time.” The comment by the department indicates that a date for assessment is problematic because of needing a larger population; that is the reason for not designating when they goals will be assessed.

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

Comments:

Only indirect assessment results or data (students were surveyed about their perceptions regarding the CTC program) were reported. No specific direct assessment results were provided. Future reviews would benefit from the inclusion of direct assessment results; as well as a description of how assessment results tie student learning goals, affirm achievement of student learning goals, and indicate the need for improvement.

Since the CTC course is being taken by students from various academic disciplines, it will be interesting to provide some direct assessment data in terms of how students from the different academic disciplines performed in the various required courses offered in the program, e.g., how the non-education students performed in the required courses as compared to the "traditional" education students.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

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

Comments:

No closing the loop actions were provided or discussed.

SUMMARY

Strengths

<u> </u>	A specific plan for assessment is in place.
<u> X </u>	Student learning goals are well-articulated.
<u> </u>	Assessment methods are clearly described.
<u> </u>	Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
<u> </u>	Assessment methods are well-implemented.
<u> </u>	Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
<u> </u>	Results are reported.
<u> </u>	Results are tied to closing the loop.
<u> </u>	(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> X </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.
<u> </u>	(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The student learning goals are well written and described. The assessment report also described vividly specific ways (direct and indirect assessment methods) by which each learning goal is assessed. Students' survey data were provided, but it will be beneficial for the department to provide direct assessment data as well. No closing the loop actions were provided or discussed. While only one participant in the student survey suggested additional elective option such as

“teaching online”, this could have been reported as a future program goal or that the department would consider offering that additional elective in the future.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

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

Reviewers:	Name	Joseph Appianing	Mary Askim-Lovseth	Jim Casler
	Department	Student	Marketing	Space Studies
	Phone Number	777-3205	777-2930	7-3462
	e-mail	Joseph.appianing@und.edu	maskim@business.und.edu	casler@space.edu

Section 1: Y Section 2: Y Section 3: N Section 4: N

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected in other years)
 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 14-15 (Academic Year)

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Teaching & Learning **DATE** 5/5/16

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Doctoral

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Casler, Askim-Lovseth, Appianing

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:

Four student learning goals are articulated clearly and then further elaborated in terms of objectives for each of the learning goals. Goal 1 has three such objectives; Goal 2 has five; Goal 3 has three; and Goal 4 has two. With respect to each objective, the educational experience, prescribed assessment method, timeline, individual/committee responsible, and deployment of results are specifically and clearly described. The annual report noted that all program goals were assessed during AY 2014-15.

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:

For each of the objectives comprising the learning goals, assessment methods are identified. That said, the listings are generally vague, or ambiguous. For example, common listings are “rubrics,” “committee approval,” “internal review,” etc. These do not engender much information as to what and how the measurement is accomplished. Specific metrics are not described for any of the learning objectives. However vaguely described, the identified methods do include both direct and indirect approaches. Indeed, the discussion specifically differentiates direct and indirect approaches.

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

Comments:

The objectives addressed in the annual report do not correspond with the learning goals and objectives identified in the assessment plan. The annual report does describe an interruption in the collection and analysis of assessment data.

However, this discontinuity does not appear to be a substantive factor in the way the data are reported. The results reported are insufficiently precise to enable a clear understanding of the issues and potential corrective actions. For example, under "Analysis," the statement "...the percentages in 'marginally meets' categories are concerning across all four indicators" offers little insight for potential corrective action. Further, while means provide an aggregated understanding of the status of a program measure, it is incomplete because articulation of the mean without supporting information does not provide information on the number of students who met, exceeded, or failed expectations; especially when the data represented the inclusion of multiple scores for some of the candidates.

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> </u>	Yes	<u> X </u>	No	<u> </u>	Qualified Y/N

Comments:

The assessment results, e.g., weakness in comprehensive exam passage rates, appear to have generated action plans. These are, however, vaguely described. For example, "...task force to review and make recommendations ..." Further, these actions appear not to be associated with the learning goals and objectives of the assessment plan.

SUMMARY

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

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Overall, despite an encouraging start in identification of learning goals and objectives, the assessment plan is insufficiently precise in identifying appropriate measures and metrics to adequately assess these goals. Further, there appears to be a substantial misalignment between the assessment plan and what is actually done.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

<u> X </u>	Annual assessment report
<u> X </u>	Assessment plan (as posted)
<u> </u>	Previous assessment review
<u> </u>	Other (please describe)

Reviewers:	Name	Jim Casler	Mary Askim-Lovseth	Joseph Appianing
	Department	<u>Space Studies</u>	<u>Marketing</u>	<u>Student</u>
	Phone Number	<u>7-3462</u>	<u>777-2930</u>	<u>777-4377</u>
	e-mail	<u>casler@space.edu</u>	<u>maskim@business.und.edu</u>	<u>Joseph.appianing@und.edu</u>

Section 1: Y Section 2: Y Section 3: N 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 = 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 2014/2015 (Academic Year)

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Teaching & Learning

DATE 4/22/2016

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Graduate Certificate in English Language Learner (ELL)

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Appianing, Askim-Lovseth, & Casler

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

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

Comments:

The ELL certificate program has no specific plan for assessment in place and no specific student learning goals were referenced in the AY2014/2015 assessment report.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|-----|--------------|----|---------------|---------------|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u> x </u> | No | <u> </u> | Qualified Y/N |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? | <u> </u> | Yes | <u> x </u> | No | <u> </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 assessment report listed how the T&L 580 Practicum would be assessed using observation and portfolio approaches. But, it is not completely clear whether those assessment methods are for the certificate or masters in ELL programs. There is no reference to how the portfolio and observation methods align with any learning goals. No specific indirect method(s) is explicitly described.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

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

Comments:

No assessment results were reported for the ELL certificate program. The assessment results provided in the AY2014/2015 assessment report were in respect of the masters in ELL program.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken?

- If so, were they based on assessment results?

- If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?

_____	Yes	<u>X</u>	No	_____	Qualified Y/N
_____	Yes	<u>X</u>	No	_____	Qualified Y/N
_____	Yes	<u>X</u>	No	_____	Qualified Y/N

Comments:

No closing the loop actions were provided or discussed.

SUMMARY

Strengths

Areas for Improvement

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

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The department needs to put in place a specific assessment plan that fully describes student learning goals and the methods (both direct and indirect methods) that will be used to assess the achievement of those learning goals.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

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

Reviewers:	Name	Joseph Appianing	Mary Askim-Lovseth	Jim Casler
	Department	<u>Student</u>	<u>Marketing</u>	<u>Space Studies</u>
	Phone Number	<u>777-3205</u>	<u>777-2930</u>	<u>7-3462</u>
	e-mail	<u>Joseph.appianing@und.edu</u>	<u>maskim@business.und.edu</u>	<u>casler@space.edu</u>

Section 1: N Section 2: N Section 3: N Section 4: N

Coding Key:

Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected in other years)

- 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 2014/2015 (Academic Year)

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Teaching & Learning

DATE 4/22/2016

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Graduate English Language Learners (ELL) Education Program

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Appianing, Askim-Lovseth, & Casler

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

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

Comments:

The Teaching and Learning department offers online masters and certificate programs in English Language Learner (ELL) Education. While the ELL program has five learning goals (see the program's Website) which are well described, these goals were not referenced in the AY 2014/2015 annual assessment report. Future reviews will benefit from the inclusion of student learning goals.

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:

The T & L department stated three main assessment areas for the ELL program in the AY 2014/2015 assessment report namely: Area 1-knowledge, instruction & assessment; Area 2- practicum; Area 3- research. The assessment report described specific learning objectives (program indicators) for each area of assessment, as well as the courses and methods through which those learning objectives will be assessed. Examples of the direct and indirect assessment methods referenced in the assessment report include case study, language analysis, lesson and unit plan, research paper/project, practicum-portfolio, and practicum-observation. The direct and indirect assessment methods described in the assessment report appropriately align with the individual learning objectives.

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 T & L department did a great job of providing assessment results for all the three assessment areas, which included the assessment tasks (specific learning objectives) and the courses where the assessment data were generated. The results were analyzed and discussed in terms of how they affirm achievement of learning objectives. The department used mainly a 3- point scale to assess students' learning, with 1 indicating "Does Not Meet Expectations"; 2 indicates "Meets Expectations"; and 3 indicates "Exceeds Expectations". While the use of the 3-point scale is highly commendable, students' results were reported in the aggregate such as the mean score achieved by the total number of students per specific learning objective or assessment task. Thus, it is difficult to know the number of students who met, exceeded, or did not meet expectations for specific assessment task. Thus, the department is encouraged to disaggregate the assessments results in terms of the number and/ or the percentage of students who met, exceeded, or did not meet the various assessment tasks.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Qualified Y/N
• If so, were they based on assessment results?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Qualified Y/N
• If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	Qualified Y/N

Comments:

Closing the loop actions were discussed in terms of the various assessment tasks and their respective results. The relevant curricula improvements or changes discussed were based on assessment results, which were also tied to goals for student learning.

SUMMARY

<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Areas for Improvement</i>
<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 type="checkbox"/> Assessment methods are clearly described.	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment methods are not clearly described.
<input 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is tied to evidence.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

In general, this is a good assessment report. However, in future assessment reports, the department is encouraged to include the overall/specific student learning goals for the ELL program as indicated on the program Website. The department is also encouraged to provide assessment results in terms of the number of students and/ or the percentage of students who met, exceeded, or did not meet specific assessment tasks rather than reporting mean figures. Reviewers did not use the AY 2014/2015 annual assessment report posted online for the university since the assessment information regarding the ELL program was limited. We contacted the T & L department chair and received the full AY 2014/2015 annual assessment report, which was the basis for this review.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Annual assessment report
<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment plan (as posted)
<input type="checkbox"/> Previous assessment review
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe)
(Received the full annual assessment report from the department chair)

Reviewers:	Name	Joseph Appianing	Mary Askim-Lovseth	Jim Casler
	Department	Student	Marketing	Space Studies
	Phone Number	777-3205	777-2930	7-3462
	e-mail	Joseph.appianing@und.edu	maskim@business.und.edu	casler@space.edu

Section 1: N 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)

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT College of Education & Human Development- Teaching & Learning

DATE 05-01-2016

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Master- Special Education

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Kenneth Flanagan, Shari Nelson, Devon Hansen

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 program offers a M.S./M.Ed. Special Education with specializations in: Autism Spectrum Disorders, Early Childhood Special Education, Emotional Disturbance, General Special Education, Intellectual Disabilities, Learning Disabilities, Strategist, and Visual Impairment

According to the 2013 annual report posted, the program has developed the following student learning goals:

- see learning as a lifelong process and understand that knowledge is constructed when meaningful connections are made through and among their experiences
- envision alternative solutions to the challenges posed in schools
- understand the impact of diversity on ways of learning
- make practical decisions based on pedagogical knowledge
- take an active role in promoting the learning of all students

There does not appear to be consistency however between the assessment plan posted that identify the student learning and the information and data presented in the three annual reports (2013, 2014 and 2015).

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

Were any specific assessment methods referenced?

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|-----|---------------|----|---------------|---------------|
| • 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> </u> | Yes | <u> </u> | No | <u>x</u> | Qualified Y/N |

Comments:

There are four assessment methods utilized in the program to assess student learning: Course Embedded Performance, Student Evaluation, IEP, and a Progress Monitoring Case Study. During the 2014-15 academic year, the focus was on the progress monitoring study which involves students in their field teaching placement assessing a student in terms of student learning goals and activities. The case study includes a determination of baseline and instructional level, implementation of a research-based intervention and monitoring the student’s response and progress. It was mentioned that the program realize it needs to develop benchmarks for three of the four assessment methods being used. While the annual reports

mention the use of student evaluation which could be considered an indirect measure, there are no indications that this or other methods were used during recent reporting periods. In addition, data for this program will no longer be disaggregated by disability but instead be aggregated under the special education major as one area for the M.S. and M. Ed. programs.

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> </u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u> x </u>	Qualified Y/N
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?	<u> </u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u> x </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:

Results were reported for the progress monitoring case study for 2015, results indicate that 164 out of 168 students scored in the proficient range and met the benchmark for this assessment method. The annual report does mention that the results indicate that the area of diversity needs attention, however, how this was determined was not shared. No student learning data was reported for 2014 or 2013.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

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

Comments:

No indication in the annual report how results informed curriculum and/or program changes.

SUMMARY

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

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Upon reviewing the posted assessment plan and three annual reports it appears that there is little consistency and cohesiveness within the assessment process. It is suggested that the program review the assessment plan and identify goals and processes that provide data over time that is useful to guide the program and measure the degree to which student learning goals are being achieved.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

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

Reviewers:	Name	<u>Kenneth Flanagan</u>	<u>Shari Nelson</u>	<u>Devon Hansen</u>
	Department	<u>Social Work, N & D</u>	<u>Student Academic Services</u>	<u>Geography</u>
	Phone Number	<u>7-3769</u>	<u>7-0562</u>	<u>7-4587</u>
	e-mail	<u>Kenneth.flanagan@und.edu</u>	<u>Shari.nelson@und.edu</u>	<u>Devon.hansen@und.edu</u>

Section 1: Y Section 2: Q Section 3: Q Section 4: N

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected in other years)
- 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)

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT College of Education & Human Development –Teaching & Learning DATE 05-01-2016

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Master's - Instructional Design & Technology

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Kenneth Flanagan, Shari Nelson, Devon Hansen

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:

In the 2013 annual report five student learning goals were identified:

1. Design. Candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to design conditions for learning by applying principles of instructional systems design, message design, instructional strategies, and learner characteristics.
2. Development. Candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to develop instructional materials and experiences using print, audiovisual, computer-based, and integrated technologies.
3. Utilization. Candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to use processes and resources for learning by applying principles and theories of media utilization, diffusion, implementation, and policy-making.
4. Management. Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to plan, organize, coordinate, and supervise instructional technology by applying principles of project, resource, delivery system, and information management.
5. Evaluation. Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to evaluate the adequacy of instruction and learning by applying principles of problem analysis, criterion-referenced measurement, formative and summative evaluation, and long-range planning.

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:

Six program assessments are listed as being used: Definition & Current Trends Paper, Instructional Design Document, Instructional Development & Evaluation Document, Internship Evaluation, Scholarly Project Evaluation Document, and Scholarly Project Document and Defense. These six documents are aligned with Association for Education

Communications and Technology standards. The plan highlights specifically what assessment methods will be used to assess student learning for each identified goal.

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

Comments:

During the past two years some assessment results were reported in the annual reports, however, the results are not clearly linked to the student goals mentioned earlier, nor is it clear how the results will influence the learning process.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

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

Comments:

While there was an analysis of the findings, it is not clear who were the recipients of the data or how this information was to be used for student learning, curriculum and program enhancement.

SUMMARY

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

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The program is collecting data and has done well in terms of defining student goals and linking assessment methods to each of the goals. There appears to be some challenges in moving towards the implementation of the methods and then using the findings to inform program operations. The implementation appears a bit fragmented and it is suggested that a review of the assessment plan could lead to greater consistency and cohesiveness in the assessment process.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

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

Reviewers:	Name	<u>Kenneth Flanagan</u>	<u>Shari Nelson</u>	<u>Devon Hansen</u>
	Department	<u>Social Work, N & D</u>	<u>Student Academic Services</u>	<u>Geography</u>
	Phone Number	<u>7-3769</u>	<u>7-0562</u>	<u>7-4587</u>
	e-mail	<u>Kenneth.flanagan@und.edu</u>	<u>Shari.nelson@und.edu</u>	<u>Devon.hansen@und.edu</u>

Section 1: Y Section 2: Y Section 3: Q Section 4: N

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected in other years)
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 2014/2015 (Academic Year)

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Teaching & Learning

DATE 4/22/2016

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Special Education: Autistic Spectrum Disorder Certificate Program (ASD)

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Joseph Appianing ,Mary Askim-Lovseth, & Jim Casler

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 Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD) Certificate Program addresses one broad goal or mission, which is "to support the provision of quality, life-long services for individuals with autistic spectrum disorders (ASD) who live in rural settings." There are two specific student learning goals listed in the AY 2014-15 annual report for students in the ASD Certificate Program. These goals are well articulated and address student learning as follows:

- Professionals who work with individuals with ASD in a rural setting will have the skills and tools needed to effectively address the many and varied challenges faced by individuals with ASD and their families.*
- Professionals will understand and utilize research based information around the provision of services.*

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:

Both direct and indirect assessment methods were referenced in the AY 2014/2015 annual report. The direct assessment method aligned with the student learning goals. This was achieved through students grades collated on the SPED 567capstone assessment course. The activity based projects in the capstone course allowed students to integrate knowledge and skills learned in other required courses including SPED 560, SPED 561 and SPED 562. Each student in the program was required to develop an assessment and intervention plan for a student with ASD. It was determined that students who earned a final grade of an A or B showed exemplary program performance.

The indirect method of assessment that was referenced in the report has to do with survey of current students. This survey took the form of informal conversations with students in the program. The purpose of the survey was to enable students to provide feedback to faculty regarding the effectiveness of the ASD certificate program. While the department indicated in the AY 2013/2014 annual report that they would use exit survey in the upcoming years to gather information for program changes and improvement, they were unable to achieve that goal in 2014/2015 academic year.

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> </u>	Yes	<u> </u>	No	<u>Y</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:

Student grades on the four required courses (SPED 560, SPED 561, SPED 562, and SPED 567) offered in the program were stated in the AY 2014/2015 annual report. The said report shows that over 96% of the students completed the required courses with exemplary course grades (a final grade of A or B). The report also shows that grades on the SPED 567 activity-based projects ranged from 78% to 100% with a mean of 95%. The current student surveys results also revealed that students in the ASD certificate program found the activity based projects and assignments designed around a case study the most useful activities that supported their learning. While the direct assessment results show great student performance in the ASD certificate program, it does not indicate the areas or course(s) for which students need to improve. This is because the results were reported in the aggregate such as percentages and means. To be able to track students' performance in the various required courses, it will be better to disaggregate the results for a particular analysis and intervention purposes.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

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

Comments:

The T & L department appears to have mechanisms in place for improving the ASD certificate courses and have a strong focus on continually adjusting their programs to enhance student learning outcomes. For instance, one of the upcoming years' objectives for improvement has to do with the use of an exist survey to gather information that will provide feedback to faculty and assist with program improvement. Another objective for future improvement relates to updating course content of all courses within ASD certificate to integrate new criteria for Diagnostic Statistical Manual (DSM) 5 for ASD". However, it is difficult to see how the proposed changes connect directly to any assessment results.

SUMMARY

Strengths

<u>X</u>	A specific plan for assessment is in place.
<u>X</u>	Student learning goals are well-articulated.
<u> </u>	Assessment methods are clearly described.
<u> </u>	Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
<u> </u>	Assessment methods are well-implemented.
<u> </u>	Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
<u> </u>	Results are reported.
<u> </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>X</u>	Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Teaching and Learning Department appears to have a good assessment plan for the ASD certificate program. The goals of the program are well-articulated and address student learning and UND's institutional goals, particularly service/citizenship. The department also uses direct and indirect assessment measures to evaluate student learning and program effectiveness.

The AY 2014/2015 annual report indicated several action plans to improve student learning and the program.

Nonetheless, it is difficult to see how these suggestions connect to assessment results.

Again, assessment data were reported in the aggregate such as means and percentages; therefore, the results were not clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement. Also, it appears that the assessment results provided in the AY 2014/2015 annual report was a "carbon copy" of the assessment results presented in the AY 2013/2014 annual report. Thus, the department is encouraged to disaggregate the assessments results in terms of how students performed on each of the four required courses—how many/percentage of students who met, exceeded, or did not meet the exemplary program performance. This will provide direction as to the type of interventions that need to be put in place in order to improve student learning outcomes.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

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

Reviewers:	Name	<u>Joseph Appianing</u>	<u>Mary Askim-Lovseth</u>	<u>Jim Casler</u>
	Department	<u>Student</u>	<u>Marketing</u>	<u>Space Studies</u>
	Phone Number	<u>777-3205</u>	<u>777-2930</u>	<u>777-3462</u>
	e-mail	<u>Joseph.appianing@und.edu</u>	<u>maskim@business.und.edu</u>	<u>casler@space.edu</u>

Section 1: Y Section 2: Y 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 = 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