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

DEPARTMENT_____ Technology _____**DATE**_____Sept 2006_____

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW_____ Lana Rakow, Elizabeth Bjerke _____

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

• Were any goals referenced?	YES_X__	NO__ _	QUALIFIED Y/N ___
• If so, were goals well articulated?	YES_X__	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N ___
• Do goals address student learning?	YES_X__	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N ___

Comments:

The Department of Technology has very well defined Goals and objectives for their undergraduate program. They have divided the goals up into six main areas: Electronics, Computer Hardware, Manufacturing, Graphic Design, CADD, and Safety and Environmental Health. These areas have very defined learning outcomes, along with the assessment tools denoted.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

Were any specific assessment methods referenced?	YES__**X**_	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N ____
• If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals?	YES__X_	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N ___
• Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach?	YES__**X**__	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N ____

Comments:

There were numerous assessment tools mentioned that the Technology Department is utilizing in order to assess student learning. The main emphasis seems to be placed on student portfolios. These portfolios are being submitted electronically and are being assessed according to a predetermined rubric.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES_**X**__	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N ____
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals?	YES_X__	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N __ __
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?	YES_X__	NO_ __	QUALIFIED Y/N ____
• Were the results tied to goals for student learning?	YES____	NO_X__	QUALIFIED Y/N _ ___

Comments:

The Department of Technology stated in their 2004-2005 annual report that the use of Assessment portfolios was successful, but had a few concerns that were addressed by the department.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?	YES___X___	NO_ ___	QUALIFIED Y/N _
• If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results			

directly address goals for student learning?　　　YES_____　　NO__X_　QUALIFIED Y/N ____

Comments:

There was no formal mention on how the assessment results were being utilized to close the loop. The original assessment plan discusses how the feedback loop should work, however there was no formal mention in the annual report of such loop being completed.

SUMMARY

Strengths	*Areas for Improvement*
__X_A specific plan for assessment is in place.	____ No specific plan for assessment is in place.
_**X**__Student learning goals are well-articulated.	_ _ Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
_X _Assessment methods are clearly described.	____ Assessment methods are not clearly described.
_X_ Assessment methods are appropriately selected.	____ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
_X_ Assessment methods are well-implemented.	____ Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
_X_ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.	____ A single type of assessment methods predominates.
_X_ Results are reported.	____ No results are reported.
____Results are tied to closing the loop.	_**X**_ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is tied to evidence.)	(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The undergraduate assessment plan for the Department of Technology seems to be implemented well. A lot of focus is placed on the use of an electronic portfolio with little discussion on other forms of assessment. It appears that they have been collecting assessment results through the portfolios and have begun making changes as a result.

It appears as if the Department of Technology is still working on developing an assessment plan for their graduate program. As of this time, they do not have one on file.

Reviewer(s):	Name	Lana Rakow	Beth Bjerke
	Department	Communication	Aviation
	Phone Number	7-2287	7-3922
	e-mail	lranarakow@mail.und.edu	ebjerke@aero.und.edu

Section 1: _Y__　　 Section 2: _Y___　　 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