## UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
**Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in** <u>2015</u> (Academic Year)

## <u>NON-ACADEMIC PROGRAMS</u>

**DEPARTMENT** <u>Disability Services for Students</u>     **DATE** <u>Nov 11, 2015</u>

**PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW** <u> </u>

**COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW** <u>Casler & Askim-Lovseth</u>

1. **STUDENT LEARNING GOALS**

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

*Comments:*
**Two goals, with accompanying objectives (6), are provided. These goals are well-articulated and are laudable. However, although they are labelled as "learning goals," only one (Objective 2.1) relates to learning and scholarly performance. The remaining goals are largely administrative tasks to be accomplished. It was noted that the "student engagement and independence" goal was assessed for 2014-15. As it is described, this appears to be aligned with Student Learning Goal 1 and its related four objectives.**

**The most recent Assessment Plan posted is dated 2011-12.**

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.

| | |
|---|---|
| _____ | 1. Communication – written or oral ("able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience") |
| _____ | 2. Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be intellectually curious"; analyze, synthesize, evaluate) |
| _____ | 3. Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be intellectually creative"; explore, discover, engage) |
| _____ | 4. Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning ("apply empirical data…analyze graphical information") |
| _____ | 5. Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluate…for effective, efficient, and ethical use") |
| _____ | 6. Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding…") |
| _____ | 7. Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelong learning") |
| _____ | 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:*
**No Essential Studies goals are articulated in the assessment plan.**

2. **ASSESSMENT METHODS**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced? | X Yes | ___ No | ___ Qualified Y/N | |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? | ___ Yes | X No | ___ Qualified Y/N | |
| • Were direct assessment methods used, when appropriate? | X Yes | ___ No | ___ Qualified Y/N | N/A |
| • Were indirect assessment methods used, when appropriate? | X Yes | ___ No | ___ Qualified Y/N | N/A |

*Comments:*

**GPA and graduation rates are the direct methods used. Several indirect methods are used. The most recent assessment reports that surveys and student meetings were conducted.**

## 3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

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

*Comments:*
**The 2015 assessment, while identifying several shortfalls, does not specifically indicate what goals and objectives were not met. Nor does it indicate the degree to which goals and objectives had been successfully met. The 2014 assessment is somewhat better at mapping achievement to goals. Neither assessment indicates how improvements should be accomplished.**

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.

1. Communication – written or oral ("able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience")
2. Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be intellectually curious"; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)
3. Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be intellectually creative"; explore, discover, engage)
4. Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning ("apply empirical data…analyze graphical information")
5. Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluate…for effective, efficient, and ethical use")
6. Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding…")
7. Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelong learning")
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:*
**None of the reported results are clearly related to institutional or Essential Studies goals. One can derive some weak connections from statements such as "Students also reported positive learning about… understanding how they learn, …" would be weakly related to Lifelong Learning.**

## 4. CLOSING THE LOOP

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Were any actions taken? | ___ Yes | ___ No | Y Qualified Y/N |
| • If so, were they based on assessment results? | ___ Yes | ___ No | Y Qualified Y/N |
| • If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning? | ___ Yes | ___ No | Y Qualified Y/N |

*Comments:*
**The 2014 assessment clearly shows that actions were taken in response to assessment of data gathered. These actions included adjustment of processes, e.g., changes to the website and a Blackboard process for delivering e-books, and adjustment of delivery methods, e.g., offering a series of learning strategy seminars. The 2015 assessment does not as clearly indicate such adjustments.**

**SUMMARY**

| *Strengths* | *Areas for Improvement* |
|---|---|
| _____ A specific plan for assessment is in place. | _____ No specific plan for assessment is in place. |
| _____ Student learning goals are well-articulated. | _____ Student learning goals are not well-articulated. |
| _____ Assessment methods are clearly described. | _____ Assessment methods are not clearly described. |
| _____ Assessment methods are appropriately selected. | _____ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected. |
| _____ Assessment methods well-implemented. | _____ Assessment methods are not well-implemented. |
| _____ Direct and indirect methods are implemented, when appropriate. | _____ A single type of assessment methods predominates although other methods are equally appropriate. |
| _____ Results are reported. | _____ No results are reported. |
| _____ Results are tied to closing the loop. (Decision-Making is tied to evidence.) | _____ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.) |

**OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**
**This is a rather slim assessment plan and the assessments offer little quantitative data and only slightly more qualitative data. Yet it appears that there is a process in place to achieve the simple and clear goals and objectives. It is encouraging that data are gathered and assessed and that the assessment results in tangible action to improve performance.**

**MATERIALS REVIEWED**
**X**   Annual assessment report (2015 & 2014)
 X   Assessment plan (as posted)
_____ Previous assessment review
 X   Other (please describe)
_____ (2006-7 assessment plan)

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

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Section 1:   Y         Section 2:   Q         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