

# UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

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

DEPARTMENT\_\_College of Business & Public Administration (MBA) \_\_\_\_DATE \_\_Apr 10, 2006\_\_

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW \_\_\_\_\_Tom Steen, Joan Hawthorne \_\_\_\_\_

### 1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

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

BPA report they are conducting assessment of their undergraduate major (focus mainly on their core), graduate masters, and certificate programs. This report does not specifically list goals they've developed but does allude to them, e.g., content mastery and skills in the UG core, and these do represent a focus on student learning. They either have or are working on (not clear from report) broken each of these two goals into subsets for the main subdivisions in the core courses—but these are not listed here. They report they want students to “reach a base level of competency in each area.”

#### *Comments:*

**Undergraduate:** See above.

**Graduate:** Goals of graduate and certificate programs are described less specifically and appear to be assumed.

### 2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

- |  |              |        |                         |
|--|--------------|--------|-------------------------|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced?   | YES <u>X</u> | NO____ | QUALIFIED Y/N ____      |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals?        | YES____      | NO____ | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>??</u> |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach? | YES <u>X</u> | NO____ | QUALIFIED Y/N ____      |

#### *Comments:*

**Undergraduate:** the report refers to a system of direct assessment rubrics that are apparently being used now in the core courses—report uses both past, present, and future tenses to describe assessment activity so it's not clear just what has been done and what is planned for future assessment. However, it appears to me that they have collected some data in specific core courses and are in process of doing more of that—this is for both major goal areas: content mastery and skills. In addition, they also use SGIDs (indirect), GenEd revalidation processes, feedback from practitioners, and professional certification examinations for Accountancy and Business Education.

**Graduate:** report refers to using comp exams and independent studies for assessment but does not specify how this is being done. They also plan to add a review process that is part of an accreditation review for assessment.

### 3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

- |  |         |             |                    |
|--|---------|-------------|--------------------|
| Were any assessment results reported?  | YES____ | NO <u>X</u> | 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 for student learning?   | YES____ | NO____      | QUALIFIED Y/N ____ |

**Comments:**

I did not find assessment results reported here in this report, although they were alluded to, especially with respect to the UG program core. This could be a function of the report not asking for a summary of results.

#### 4. CLOSING THE LOOP

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

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:**

**Undergraduate:** The College reports that they are involved actively in using the results of their rubrics in core courses, and they feel that the results tell them that a) students learning is largely satisfactory and b) they need to refine their rubrics and assessment system. However, without a more specific listing of goals-method-results, it's difficult to provide more detailed feedback on their assessment plan.

**Graduate:** Most of the report deals with their work on the UG core. For both the Masters work and the certificate program, it is not clear from this report that they are putting assessment results to use in a way that we would call "closing the loop."

#### 5. SUMMARY

*Strengths*

*Areas for Improvement*

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

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

#### OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

As indicated above, the report indicates that CoBPA is involved in a substantial amount of assessment activity, especially in the UG core courses, and they appear to have an assessment plan in operation. I believe that they probably have student learning goals spelled out, at least in the core, but it would be good to show them here. More importantly, it is not clear to me that assessment results are being aggregated for the college in such a way as to allow faculty look at them together and check on the overall success of their students. They are looking at ways to revise their system (rubrics), but the key missing link to me is the aggregation problem.

These remarks are focused on the assessment plan for the UG core. The other programs sound as though they are not at the same level for assessment so that suggests a second direction for future assessment plan work (assuming that this report indicates the actual state of assessment in the college).

Reviewer(s):	Name	Tom Steen	Joan Hawthorne
	Department	PEXS	Provost's Office
	Phone Number	7-4343	7-4684
	e-mail	<a href="mailto:thomas_steen@und.nodak.edu">thomas_steen@und.nodak.edu</a>	<a href="mailto:joan_hawthorne@und.nodak.edu">joan_hawthorne@und.nodak.edu</a>

-----

Section 1: \_\_?\_\_    Section 2: \_\_Y\_\_    Section 3: \_\_N\_\_    Section 4: \_\_?\_\_

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