

## UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

### Feedback to Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2004-2005 Annual Reports

DEPARTMENT Aviation DATE April 9, 2006

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Nabil Suleiman, Renee Mabey

#### 1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

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

##### *Comments:*

**Undergraduate:** The Aviation program is primarily an undergraduate program. A masters program was introduced in 2001. However, the four departmental goals and learning objectives that were outlined pertain to the undergraduate, graduate, certificate, and professional programs. Many of the goals were derived from the department's mission statement and used to serve as the basis for assessment activities. Utilization of technology seems to be the common thread between student learning in the classroom and the industry at large.

#### 2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

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

##### *Comments:*

**Undergraduate:** There are three assessment methods listed and named after their targeted groups. The targeted groups are: the student body, Alumni, and Aviation industry. For each assessment method, several assessment techniques, the goals being assessed, assessment frequency, and assessment responsibility were clearly laid out. For example, the student body assessment techniques included graduation interviews, random focus groups, Stage check completion rates, the ATC test, and the certified member test.

#### 3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

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

##### *Comments:*

**Undergraduate:** Detailed assessment plans are outlined. The plan activities are related to the goals of student learning. Some results were reported, specifically the restructuring of the aviation curriculum and publication of the Assessment Chronicle for delivery of assessment findings to departmental faculty and staff. Future changes and improvements are under discussion.

#### 4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?

YES UG NO G QUALIFIED Y/N \_\_\_\_\_

- If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?

YES UG NO G QUALIFIED Y/N \_\_\_\_\_

#### *Comments:*

**Undergraduate:** The Aviation program had to rewrite all the flight training course outlines and restructure the curriculum to better meet department goals and learning objectives. As a result of feedback from the Aviation assessment committee an interpersonal communication course was added. The department also published its first and second assessment chronicles that detailed out the findings and was distributed to all faculty members.

#### SUMMARY

##### *Strengths*

- UG A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- UG Student learning goals are well-articulated.
- UG Assessment methods are clearly described.
- UG Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
- UG Assessment methods are well-implemented.
- UG Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
- UG Results are reported.
- UG Results are tied to closing the loop.  
(Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

##### *Areas for Improvement*

- G No specific plan for assessment is in place.
- G Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
- G Assessment methods are not clearly described.
- G Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
- G Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
- G A single type of assessment methods predominates.
- G No results are reported.
- G Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.  
(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

#### OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Aviation department program has a well designed undergraduate assessment plan in place with references to learning objectives and a full schedule of activities timeline. The reported results have triggered a full review of the assessment plan and changes are underway. More detailed results with references to learning objectives are always encouraged. When the revised assessment plan is in place and new activities and results are reported, a more meaningful review will be offered.

Currently, the departmental focus is on the assessment of undergraduate student learning. The reviewers strongly encourage the development of a similarly comprehensive assessment plan for graduate student learning.

Reviewer(s):	Name	Nabil Suleiman, PhD	Renee Mabey, PT, PhD
	Department	Civil Engineering	Physical Therapy Department
	Phone Number	777-3997; 777-3782	777-2831; 777-4854
	e-mail	nabilsuleiman@mail.und.edu	rmabey@medicine.nodak.edu

Section 1 for **UG**: Y Section 2: Y Section 3: Y Section 4: Y  
Section 1 for **G**: N Section 2: N Section 3: N Section 4: N

#### 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