

**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**  
**Feedback to Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2004-2005 Annual Reports**

**DEPARTMENT** Marketing **DATE** 8-21-06

**COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW** Joan Hawthorne, Paul Sum

**1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS**

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

**Comments:**

**Undergraduate:**

The goals are clearly articulated and related to student learning. The assessment plan goals match the goals stated in the annual report.

Goals are clearly articulated in three areas, two of which directly align with university goals and gen ed goals. The alignment between departmental goal #2 ("students will demonstrate critical thinking and analytic skills relating to the application of marketing theory to marketing issues and opportunities") with university and gen ed goals related to critical thinking, and between departmental goal #3 ("students will develop written, oral, and visual communication skills that will aid in the personal understanding of marketing and its communication to others") with university and general education goals regarding oral and written communication.

**Graduate:** Marketing is one of several departments that contribute to the MBA program. It offers a single course at the graduate level as its contribution. Relevant material for assessment of the MBA is located at the college level which is assessed as a unique program under the College of Business & Public Administration. Thus, this report only refers to the undergraduate program.

**2. ASSESSMENT METHODS**

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

**Comments:**

**Undergraduate:**

At the close of the academic year covered in this report, the department had begun development of an assessment plan that includes collection of data via survey instruments (Mktg 305), course examinations, and qualitative analyses (including content analysis of papers; Mktg 305 and 312). The Annual Report is somewhat vague as to the nature of these methods and the expected standards of achievement; faculty plan to develop rubrics in Fall 2005 for use later that year, and the rubrics will cover team skills, oral communication, and written communication.

**Graduate:** NA

**3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS**

- |                                       |              |                |                           |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Were any assessment results reported? | YES <u>x</u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|---------------------------|

- 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:**

**Undergraduate:**

As an assessment of goal #1, data were collected from Marketing 305 during 2004-05. Analysis showed what faculty described as a “high level of retention” on items related to 14 core concepts. Pilot data collected in two classes and reviewed in terms of the communication goal showed improvements are needed in organization, critical thinking, citation style and content, development, and general composition.

However, in other areas the methods of assessment are vague. Therefore, it is difficult to say whether the results do or do not affirm the achievement of goals, if the results points to clear avenues for improvement, or how the results tied to goals for student learning. The assessment plan clearly states student learning goals and objectives but the ambiguity in reporting the nature of the instrument makes it difficult to link the methods/results to the goals.

**Graduate:** NA

#### 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 report notes that the department approved and implemented the assessment plan in March 2005. At this early stage in the process, faculty do not consider the data sufficiently definitive to provoke action. Additional assessment tools will developed. Data will continue to be collected and monitored.

**Graduate:** NA

#### SUMMARY

*Strengths*

- ☒ 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.)

*Areas for Improvement*

- ☐ 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:

Marketing faculty appear to be at any early stage in implementing their assessment plan. Faculty do have specific goals and objectives for student learning, which appear to be appropriate for their program. The annual report shows that they have selected some methods, are beginning implementation, and are collecting initial data. It is too early for the department to be closing the loop at this point.

Our recommendation is for the department to continue collecting data in relation to at least one of the learning goals each year, and to begin making use of findings as soon as sufficient data have been collected. Implementing rubrics, as planned, will help the department by providing a stable structure against which student work can be measured.

Reviewer(s):	Name	Joan Hawthorne	Paul Sum
	Department	Asst Provost	Political Science and Public Administration
	Phone Number	7-4684	7-3831
	e-mail	<a href="mailto:joan_hawthorne@und.nodak.edu">joan_hawthorne@und.nodak.edu</a>	<a href="mailto:paul.sum@und.nodak.edu">paul.sum@und.nodak.edu</a>

---

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