

## UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

### Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2007-08 Annual Reports

DEPARTMENT Accounting/Business Law

DATE MAY 4, 2009

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW

Jon Jackson, Assessment Committee

#### 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:**

**Graduate:** N/A

In addition to the Departmental goals, please also consider UND's Institutional and Essential Studies goals for student learning (shown in alignment within parentheses). Use 'U' (undergraduate) or 'G' (graduate) to identify UND/Essential Studies goals which are similar to the referenced departmental goals.

- |                            |   |  |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> U | 1 | Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> U | 2 | Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)       |
| <input type="checkbox"/>   | 3 | Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage)          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> U | 4 | Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”)         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ? | 5 | Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”)              |
| <input type="checkbox"/>   | 6 | Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”)                               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> U | 7 | Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> U | 8 | Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)                        |

#### Comments regarding departmental goals and alignment of departmental goals with institutional and Essential Studies goals:

**Undergraduate:**

It seems apparent that learning goals are tied to success in the profession, and are a product of a strong relationship between the department and some of the region's major accounting firms, who recruit heavily out of the UND CPBA. Although the phrasing isn't a literal restatement of the ES goals, only two areas appear to be totally left out of the statement of student learning goals.

**Graduate:** N/A

#### 2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

- |  |                              |                             |   |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced?   | YES <input type="checkbox"/> | NO <input type="checkbox"/> | QUALIFIED Y/N <input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

#### Comments:

**Undergraduate:** Both direct and indirect methods appear to be used, by design or otherwise. No reference as to how or even *if* the national CPA exams referenced in the annual report themselves assess student learning. However, the report

indicates that the CPA exam results “indicate a relatively good student learning accomplishment and above-average skill and knowledge on the part of program graduates.”

While it’s reasonable to assume that concerns arising from the assessment of the top half of the class might be applicable to the entire class, there doesn’t appear to be the same sort of summative assessment of students who do *not* take the CPA exam. Might not there be performance concerns with these students, described in the annual report as “about half the graduating class,” that a summative assessment of their achievement *vis a vis* the department’s learning goals would identify and allow for attention by “closing the loop” activities?

Other assessment activities, such as the departmental assessment committee review of special classroom projects and internship “debriefing survey” appear to be creative attempts to assess student performance in a way that achieves a useful benchmark against the professional learning goals referenced above.

**Graduate:** N/A

### 3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

|  |           |       |                       |
|--|-----------|-------|-----------------------|
| Were any assessment results reported?  | YES___    | NO___ | QUALIFIED Y/N ___X___ |
| • 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__X___ | NO___ | QUALIFIED Y/N ___     |

#### *Comments:*

**Undergraduate:** The use of a number of direct and indirect measures (with the concomitant difficulties in reporting and making sense of the different format in relation to one another) here is very helpful, having led the faculty to identify areas where improvement could be targeted as “low-hanging fruit” with minimal change to curriculum. Again, the employer-satisfaction and alumni-satisfaction as well as “senior-satisfaction” surveys seem to get at areas where improvement could be achieved, although these areas are not listed in this section of the report.

**Graduate:** N/A

In addition to departmental goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. Use ‘U’ (undergraduate) or ‘G’ (graduate) to identify those results which are applicable to institutional/Essential Studies goal achievement. For indicated items, please describe findings in the appropriate section below. .

- \_\_\_U\_\_\_ 1 Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”)
- \_\_\_U\_\_\_ 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)
- \_\_\_U\_\_\_ 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage)
- \_\_\_U\_\_\_ 4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”)
- \_\_\_U\_\_\_ 5 Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6 Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7 Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8 Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)

#### *Comments regarding results and the application of results to departmental, institutional and Essential Studies goals:*

**Undergraduate:** N/A

**Graduate:** N/A

### 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 ☒ X ☐ NO ☐ QUALIFIED Y/N ☐

**Comments:**

**Undergraduate:** Here the enviable (again, that word) relationship with alumni and employers pays dividends, with the perceived need to increase emphasis in communication skills among the majors emerging as a target area for special attention in both classroom work as well as future assessment activities.

**Graduate:** N/A

**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:**

The department has an enviable relationship and reputation with employers and recruiters of their alumni, built from the performance of the faculty and students. The data and feedback collected but not shared formally here (or with the department?) suggest UND accountancy & business law students continue to score high relative to other institutions in the learning goal areas listed as part of the departmental assessment plan. Perceived weaknesses have been identified and curricula have been adapted to address these areas of perceived shortcoming.

|              |              |   |                          |                          |
|--------------|--------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Reviewer(s): | Name         | <input type="checkbox"/> Jon Jackson                | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|              | Department   | <input type="checkbox"/> Anatomy & Cell Biology     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|              | Phone Number | <input type="checkbox"/> 7-2101                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|              | e-mail       | <input type="checkbox"/> jackson@medicine.nodak.edu | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Section 1: ☐ Y ☐ Section 2: ☐ Y ☐ Section 3: ☐ Y/? ☐ Section 4: ☐ Y ☐

**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