

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

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

DEPARTMENT Management DATE May 10, 2006

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Lana Rakow, Joan Hawthorne

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|--|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | NO <input type="checkbox"/> | QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/> |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | NO <input type="checkbox"/> | QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/> |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | NO <input type="checkbox"/> | QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments:

Undergraduate: Goals align with university goals for analytical problem solving (informed choices, goal 1), communication (goal 2), and ethics (related to goal 6). Also align with gen ed goals for analytical problem solving (critical thinking, GE goal 2), informed choices (goal 3), and communication (goal 1). Goals for majors were thoughtfully and carefully identified through an extended faculty process. The assessment plan still needs to be developed.

Graduate: Management contributes 3 required courses to the MBA (offered through CoBPA), but does not offer its own graduate program. MBA goals are not articulated in the departmental annual report.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

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

Comments:

Undergraduate: The assessment plan is not completed, although the report describes an intention to determine data needs and specific tools based on this newly developed set of goals.

Graduate:

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

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

Comments:

Undergraduate: Observations based on their audit of courses in relationship to new goals were offered, but no assessment data was specifically described as collected. According to the audit, all seven core courses contribute to goal 1 and 3, three courses contribute to goal 2, and two courses contribute to goal 4; three courses contribute to three or more of the four program goals.

Graduate:

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

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

YES _____ NO x _____ 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:

Graduate:

SUMMARY

Strengths

- _____ A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- x 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.)

Areas for Improvement

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

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The department has done a very good job of involving faculty in identifying course goals leading to program goals. The department recognizes the need to now identify assessment methods and collect data. These actions should be reflected on the 2005-06 annual report.

Reviewer(s):	Name	Joan Hawthorne	Lana Rakow
	Department	Provost's Office	Communication
	Phone Number	7-4684	7-0675
	e-mail	joan_hawthorne@und.nodak.edu	lanarakow@maili.und.nodak.edu

Section 1: Y 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