

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2015-15 (Academic Year)

NON-ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Women's Center

DATE 11/30/15

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW _____

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

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

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

Comments:

The Women's Center assessment plan was most recently updated in the 2013-14 academic year. In this plan they identify four outcomes that they align with UND's general/essential studies goals. These learning outcomes are broadly identified, but would benefit from development into full sentences. Two target groups are identified: Students enrolled in IMPACT classes/workshops Students participating in programs sponsored/co-sponsored by Women's Center. The learning goals and assessment plan have not appear to have changed since 2007 (there are 2012 and 2013 versions on file, but no to little changes were made). The office may want to review and update the plan.

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) |
| _____ | 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”) |
| <u>X</u> | 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:

The following four learning outcome areas are aligned with multiple areas of the essential studies goals:

- A) Cognitive Complexity (critical thinking, effective reasoning, emotion/cognition integration; reflective thinking)
- B) Interpersonal and Intrapersonal Competence (Realistic self-appraisal and self-understanding; personal attributes such as self-esteem, confidence, ethics and integrity, meaningful relationships; interdependence)
- C) Humanitarianism (understanding and appreciation of human differences; social responsibility)
- D) Practical Competence (effective communication; capacity to manage one's affairs; maintain health and wellness; living a purposeful and satisfying life)

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

- | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|-----|----------|----|-------|---------------|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced? | <u>X</u> | Yes | _____ | No | _____ | Qualified Y/N |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? | _____ | Yes | <u>X</u> | No | _____ | Qualified Y/N |

- Were direct assessment methods used, when appropriate? Yes No Qualified Y/N N/A
- Were indirect assessment methods used, when appropriate? Yes No Qualified Y/N N/A

Comments:

Multiple assessment methods were listed to assess the learning outcomes across the two target groups. First, to assess students in the IMPACT classes, pre- and post- psychological instruments (Self-esteem Scale & Empowerment Scale), a questionnaire to assess the rating of their task specific self-efficacy relevant to self-defense, and journaling to measure attitudes and beliefs are employed. Second, students participating in Women’s Center programs will be evaluated using pre- and post-questionnaires, program evaluations, and interviews.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

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

Comments:

There are annual reports for years 2013-2015 that contribute to this review. The 2013 review provided information and data for a Women’s Center sponsored event—the ND Clothesline Project. The event was evaluated through a research project with the Social Work Department. Results were reported as survey percentages and qualitative themes. The 2014 and 2015 reports provided less data. The reports described the methods, The type of information collected from assessments, and provided general outcomes (e.g., increased confidence, enhanced sense of empowerment, students endorse fewer overt and subtle forms of sexism, etc.), but did not provide data. Some intent to make changes are evident (e.g., starting an Advisory Board and changing the measures used for the IMPACT class), but not tied to results.

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:

While not directly addressed, most assessments examined their aspects of the office’s Interpersonal/Intrapersonal Competence (e.g., self-esteem, confidence, self-understanding) and Humanitarianism goals across the IMPACT course and sponsored/co-sponsored programs. No institutional or Essential Studies goals are directly addressed.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

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

Comments:

Some changes were indicated (e.g. starting an Advisory Board in the 2013 report and changing the measures used for the IMPACT class in the 2015 report), but it was unclear if they have been implemented. In the 2013 report a proposed 3 changes—Development of a bystander intervention program, increasing the number of IMPACT staff, and the development of a Student Advisory Board. These changes were not tied to assessment results and, while they were tied to goals, they weren't related to learning goals. The changes were not addressed in the 2014 or 2015 reports. In the most recent 2015 report the measures used for the IMPACT class are different than previously reported; it is unclear if they have been implemented or why the change was made. The change was not explicitly tied to previous results or learning goals.

SUMMARY

Strengths

Areas for Improvement

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

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The assessment plan and annual reports are generally well developed and provide significant description about the assessments/measures. The older report provided a lot of data from assessments, 2014 and 2015 reports less detail. In future reports, particularly in review years, data would be useful. In addition, tying any changes or improvements to learning goals and assessment results would bolster their utility.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

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

Reviewers	Name	<u>Casey Ozaki</u>	<u>Surojit Gupta</u>	_____
	Department	<u>Teaching & Learning</u>	_____	_____
	Phone Number	<u>X74256</u>	_____	_____
	e-mail	<u>carolyn.ozaki@und.edu</u>	_____	_____

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

