

December 9, 2009

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Non-Academic Units on Assessment Activities Reported in 2008-09 Annual Reports
NON-ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Student Success Center DATE Nov. 30, 2009

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Fred Remer / Shane Gerbert

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

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

Comments:

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> </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>N</u> | 3 | Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage) |
| <u>N</u> | 4 | Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”) |
| <u>N</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>N</u> | 7 | Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”) |
| <u>N</u> | 8 | Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”) |

Comments regarding departmental goals and alignment of program goals with institutional and Essential Studies goals:

The Student Success Center (SSC) was formed in August 2007 through the consolidation of the University Learning Center (ULC) and Student Academic Services (SAS). The SSC has not consolidated its assessment plans into one and continues to use both the ULC and SAS plans for assessment.

The goals of each department within the Student Success Center (SSC) were referenced and well articulated. However, their mission is to “provide programs and services to students to aid in the development and implementation of their educational plans and goals.” Therefore, the SSC's goals are not necessarily aligned with UND's Institutional and Essential Studies Goals for student learning. The ES goals of communication, critical thinking and information literacy may be addressed indirectly through the advising process.

Another place that ES goals may be addressed is in the courses offered by the SSC (UNIV 101, UNIV 125, UNIV 126, and UNIV 127). One of the ULC's goals is to “provide a quality curriculum with a solid foundation of study to prepare students for rich, full productive lives.” One of the objectives is to “assess and revamp, if necessary, current courses offered by the ULC to include the General Education goals such as informed choices, writing, communication (oral and writing), and cross-cultural appreciation (diversity).” It appears that the ULC is mindful of ES goals and plans to incorporate them into the courses that they offer. Also, UNIV 127 Critical Thinking Skills for College looks as if it would address the ES goals of Critical Thinking.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

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

Comments:

December 9, 2009

The assessment plan for SAS provides information about the measurement tools which were used in academic advising, UNIV 101 Intro to University Life, Transfer Student Getting Started, Freshman Getting Started and Keep Going. The tools are generally aligned to the goals of each program, but the assessment plan was not detailed enough to correlate how each individual goal was assessed. The metrics rely heavily on indirect assessment, including interim and final evaluations, debriefings and one-on-one interaction.

The assessment plan for the ULC is better correlated and does list an assessment metric for each goal, objective and outcome. A balance of direct and indirect tools are used for assessment. The assessment plan also lists a timeline and responsible entity for each tool.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

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

Comments:

The SSC 2008-2009 annual report does state that assessment was performed, but no detailed information was provided. The report indicates that many tools were used, but very general and vague results were reported. As an example, the report states that “results of the 2008 pre- and post-assessments showed an increase in performance from the beginning of the semester to the end of the term which reinforces student learning is occurring in the classroom” for the UNIV 101 Intro to Student Life course. As noted earlier, many of the tools were not directly correlated to the goals identified in the assessment plan.

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. .

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

Overall, the results were used to improve the individual unit’s performance and to meet the organization’s goals. Few results related to ES goals. The report noted that for UNIV 101 Intro to Student Life, “Students are asked to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the learning goals through ... oral presentations, reflection papers, and participation in cross-cultural activities that reflect real world scenarios.” The reference indicates indirectly that assessment includes communication and diversity, but no results were reported.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?	YES ___	NO ___	QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u>
• If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	YES ___	NO <u>X</u>	QUALIFIED Y/N ___

Comments:

The report indicates that for each program, assessment results were used to make changes to the program. Details of the analysis of data and the resulting changes were not provided. However, a timeline for the implementation of new strategies

December 9, 2009

was given. Changes were also made in the assessment strategy for individual programs. It is difficult to determine if the assessment results influenced changes since no results were reported. Results were reportedly used to make changes to the programs.

SUMMARY

Strengths

Areas for Improvement

- 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.)

- 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:

It is evident that the SSC is doing assessment and making changes based on their results. The documentation of the assessment methods, results and program changes is minimal. A few of the program goals may be tied to ES goals, but there needs to be better correlation between them. The SSC is encouraged to provide more detailed assessment results in the next reporting cycle.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

- Annual report
- Appendices (cited in annual report)
- Other (please describe) SAS and 2007 ULC Assessment Plans (obtained from SSC)
- Assessment plan (as posted)
- Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	<u>Fred Remer</u>	<u>Shane Gerbert</u>
	Department	<u>Atmospheric Sciences</u>	<u>Aviation</u>
	Phone Number	<u>777-4055</u>	<u>702-265-3489</u>
	e-mail	<u>rem@aero.und.edu</u>	<u>shane.gerbert@und.edu</u>

Section 1: Y Section 2: ? Section 3: ? Section 4: ?

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well
- N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA = no information available
- ? = action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done