

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

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

NON-ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Writing Center DATE _____

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Writing Center

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

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

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

Comments:

The current assessment plan for the Writing Center is dated 3/5/13 and consists of revised goals for both the student writers and the student writing consultants. Another change from the previous plan is the addition of goals for graduate student writing consultants. The goals are as stated below:

Goals for Student Writers

At the end of a writing center session,

- 1. Writers will be able to explain what they plan to do next in the writing process.*
- 2. Writers will demonstrate positive self-efficacy regarding a specific writing task and/or writing generally.*

Goals for Student Writing Consultants

While employed at the Writing Center, student writing consultants will continuously practice each of the UND Essential Studies goals. After completing employment at the Writing Center, writing consultants will be able to apply their writing center experience in each goal area to their professional and/or personal activities.

- 1. Thinking and Reasoning: Consultants should be able to use a variety of thinking and reasoning skills, apply these skills as appropriate in various situations, and move among them depending on purpose.*
- 2. Communication: Consultants should be able to write and speak in civic, academic, and professional settings with a sense of purpose and audience.*
- 3. Information Literacy: Consultants should be able to access and evaluate information for effective, efficient, and ethical use in a variety of contexts.*
- 4. Diversity: Consultants should be able to demonstrate understanding of social-cultural diversity and use that understanding to address issues, solve problems, and shape civic, personal, and professional behavior.*

In addition, there is added detailed explanation under each of the above goals indicating what each outcome "looks like at the Writing Center." This provides a helpful description for outside readers and potential student employees.

Goals for Graduate Student Writing Consultants

In addition to meeting the goals above, after completing an assistantship in the Writing Center, graduate student writing consultants will be able to

- 1. Apply their Writing Center experience to their teaching and/or*
- 2. Apply their Writing Center experience to their writing*

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> </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> 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:

As referenced in the 2012 review of the Writing Center, the goal of increasing writing strategies for student writers and student writing consultants aligns with the Essential Studies communication goal. The goal for student writing consultants of gaining increased analytical skills connects to the Essential Studies goal of thinking and reasoning (critical thinking). The goal for student writing consultants of gaining increased cross-cultural skills aligns with the diversity goal of Essential Studies. In the updated plan, there is now an outcome that aligns with the Essential Studies goal of Information Literacy.

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

Comments:

Student Writers - Indirect assessment data is collected through a survey administered mid-semester each spring. Direct assessment consists of peer observation of writing sessions by consultants who are trained to use an observation guide.

Student Writing Consultants – Indirect assessment of student writing consultants was under development as of the writing of the 2013 assessment plan and is described as a survey sent out to all writing consultant alumni employed within the past three years. Direct assessment data is collected through peer observation via the use of an observation guide. After the observation, the peer observer and consultant meet to discuss strengths, weakness, and ways to improve.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

| | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Were any assessment results reported? | <u> </u> Yes | <u> </u> No | <u> X </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:

There is not an assessment report posted; however, assessment results were provided by the Writing Center Coordinator. (The Writing Center has undergone multiple transitions over the last 2-3 years including interim coordinators and currently a new coordinator.) The results provided by the Coordinator indicate that no data was collected for the assessment methods identified in the assessment plan. The Center did send a voluntary survey via email to student writers following an appointment asking the users to respond to the following: (1) After your session, how did you feel (confidence)?, (2) I will return to the Writing Center, and (3) I will recommend the Writing Center. Question #1 results are reported below:

- *After your session, how did you feel?*
 - *About the same – 4.26% (19)*
 - *Less confident than before the session – 2.19% (5)*
 - *More confident than before the session – 94.62% (422)*

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> </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:

Students were surveyed on satisfaction and confidence following the appointment. Assessment was not conducted on institutional or Essential Studies goals.

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 assessment report was posted.

SUMMARY

| <i>Strengths</i> | <i>Areas for Improvement</i> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <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> X </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> </u> Results are reported. | <u> X </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:

The Writing Center has in place an assessment plan with well-articulated goals, indirect/direct assessment methods, and a well-intended closing the loop process. The Center is to be commended for the changes made in the 2013 assessment plan. The plan is clear, concise, and easy to read.

Assessment results reported do not address student learning; rather, they report on satisfaction and confidence.

The committee wants to acknowledge its awareness of the transitions that the Writing Center has undergone in previous years which has influenced the assessment cycle. The Writing Center Coordinator has expressed his strong commitment to the assessment process in the future, including a new assessment plan and subsequent assessment reports.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

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

Assessment results provided by the Writing Center Coordinator.

| Reviewers | Name | Devon Hansen | Ken Flanagan | Shari Nelson |
|-----------|--------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| | Department | Geography | Social Work | Student Academic Services |
| | Phone Number | 701.777.4587 | 701.777.3769 | 701.777.0562 |
| | e-mail | devon.hansen@und.edu | kenneth.flanagan@und.edu | shari.nelson@und.edu |

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