

# UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

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

## NON-ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Dean of Students DATE 12/08/2015

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Dean of Students

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Brad Myers, Deborah Worley, Shawn McHale

### 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:**

*Some goals address student learning such as: understanding how actions impact communities, clarifying personal values, and developing an understanding of the student conduct process. Other goals are also included in the Assessment Plan such as: referring students to support services that are appropriate to her/his needs, and not incurring another Code of Student Life violation.*

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>    </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>    X</u> | 8. Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)                        |  |  |  |  |

**Comments regarding program goals and alignment with institutional and Essential Studies goals:**

*Consideration of how actions impact communities directly aligns with the essential studies goal of service/citizenship.*

### 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 direct assessment methods used, when appropriate?  | <u>    </u> | Yes | <u>    </u> | No | <u>X</u>    | Qualified Y/N N/A |
| • Were indirect assessment methods used, when appropriate?  | <u>X</u>    | Yes | <u>    </u> | No | <u>    </u> | Qualified Y/N N/A |

**Comments:**

A single assessment method was described in the Assessment Plan: collecting data via pre-post surveys for the student conduct process. Details of when the surveys are administered were provided in the plan. The Assessment Report describes data that were collected via other methods, such as tracking referrals and student participation in alcohol education 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>  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:**

Assessment results were reported in the form of percentages of respondents to the post-survey (the total number of respondents was not reported), the number of referrals made, and the number of participants in alcohol education programs in the FY2015 Assessment Report. The results were aligned with each goal and objective that was included in the posted Assessment Plan. For example:

- 53% of the students who completed the survey indicated that they now better understand the impact that their actions have on their communities.
- 67% of the students who completed the survey indicated that they now have a better understanding of the potential impact that their decisions have on their academic success.
- 63% of the students who completed the survey indicated that they reflected on and developed their personal values during the student conduct process.
- 67% of students indicated that they felt that their actions prior to the student conduct process were consistent with their personal values. 97% of students indicated that they feel that their actions following the student conduct process have been consistent with their personal values.
- During FY15 the student conduct process made 412 referrals to the University Counseling Center and other support services.
- 89% of students who completed the SCARP (ongoing alcohol education) program indicated that they would be willing to continue to utilize counseling services for substance related or personal issues.
- 63% of students who completed the survey reported that they understood the reasoning behind the decision made during their student conduct process.
- 13% of students who had a student conduct hearing regarding the Code of Student Life had more than one hearing.

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>    </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>  X  </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>  X  </u> | 8. Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)                        |

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

The assessment result of the percentage of students (respondents to the survey) who understand how their actions impact communities is directly related to the Essential Studies goal of service/citizenship. Information literacy seems to be indirectly addressed through the assessment results, particularly related to how students understand the student conduct process and the relationship to their personal values before and after participating in the process.

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

**Comments:**

*According to the FY2015 Assessment Report, the Dean of Students office used the assessment results in several ways, primarily to “inform practices and to enhance the delivery of the student conduct process.” For example, as a result of what they learned from the pre-post survey, they increased the level of student contact and family involvement for students with multiple alcohol or drug violations. They also indicated that they updated their tracking system and the instruments used to collect data from students. Although the improvements and changes that resulted from analysis of assessment data impacted programming and data collection processes (and not student learning directly), the actions taken are appropriate for the Dean of Students office and for the goals that they addressed.*

**SUMMARY**

***Strengths***

***Areas for Improvement***

<u>X</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>    </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 well-implemented.	<u>    </u> Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
<u>    </u> Direct and indirect methods are implemented, when appropriate.	<u>    </u> A single type of assessment methods predominates although other methods are equally appropriate.
<u>X</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>    </u> Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

**OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

*The Dean of Students office utilizes a well-developed set of learning goals for students who are involved in the student conduct process. Although not all goals address student learning, they are appropriate goals for the student conduct process. A single method of assessment is described in the Assessment Plan although assessment results are also reported that stem from tracking of responses and participation in alcohol education programs. The overall report of assessment results is thorough. It is easy to see the alignment between goals, outcomes, and results. It might be helpful if, in the future, more changes in percentages (or change in response by participant) are reported. Using the pre- and post-survey design should facilitate this level of data reporting. Also, providing the total number of respondents is necessary to provide context for the reported percentages in the Assessment Report.*

*Several examples of “closing the loop” activities were provided. In addition to describing the actual take-aways from the assessment results, the author of the Assessment Report also described how the staff is making some changes to how they analyze assessment results so that they can make the best use of tools, like dashboards, to help them understand the relationships between some of the variables of interest, such as the number of Code of Student Life violations and retention rates. This relationship would be quite interesting to see in the results section of the Assessment Report. They also revamped their tracking methods and instruments used for data collection so that a more robust analysis could be performed in the future. Details of how the tracking method changed and how the instruments changed were not available.*

**MATERIALS REVIEWED**

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

Reviewers	Name	<u>Brad Myers</u>	<u>Deb Worley</u>	<u>Shawn McHale</u>
	Department	<u>Law School</u>	<u>Ed Leadership</u>	<u>student</u>
	Phone Number	<u>7-2228</u>	<u>7-3140</u>	
	e-mail	<u>Bradley.myers@und.edu</u>	<u>Deborah.worley@und.edu</u>	<u>Shawn.mchale@und.edu</u>

\*\*\*\*\*

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

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected in other years)
- Q = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done
- N= no, it is unclear whether it was done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning