

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2010-2011 Annual Reports
GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Aviation **DATE** January 11, 2012

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Krista Lynn Minnotte and Mary Askim-Lovseth

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:

Student learning goals are referenced and they are generally well-articulated. One objective, “students will realize that being a professional requires a continual drive to develop and update an individual’s skill set,” appears difficult to directly measure. Overall, the goals and objectives lend themselves to assessment and address student learning.

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>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </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:

Specific assessment methods are referenced, and these methods are aligned with the individual goals. The assessment plan mentions both direct and indirect methods and the assessment report states that both forms of assessment were used.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

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

Comments:

No specific data were reported, only vague statements relating to students expressing satisfaction and “it appears the student’s writing has been improving.” Moreover, the results, as communicated, do not appear to be the kind of results that would be yielded if the assessment plan (as posted) were implemented. It is not clear how the results affirm achievement of goals or areas for potential improvement. The results are not communicated in a way that allows an outside reader to see the connections between the findings and the specific student learning goals.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

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

YES _____ NO _____ QUALIFIED Y/N X _____

- 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:

The results section of the assessment report states that changes were made to Avit 501 on the basis of assessment results. It is not clear what these assessment results were or how they were tied to student learning goals. Other comments in this section were regarding timelines of when the assessment activities were done.

SUMMARY***Strengths******Areas for Improvement***

X 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.
X 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.
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 assessment plan has clearly stated goals and objectives that are directly tied to student learning. The assessment plan also incorporates both direct and indirect methods and provides connections between the methods of assessment and the student-learning goals. However, the assessment results, as reported in the annual report, suggest that the department may have yet to implement their assessment plan. If implemented, the assessment plan should yield results that are directly tied to student learning goals that allow the Aviation Department to determine the extent to which these goals are being met.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

X Annual report
 _____ Appendices (cited in annual report)
 _____ Other (please describe)

X Assessment plan (as posted)
 _____ Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	Krista Lynn Minnotte	Mary Askim-Lovseth
	Department	Sociology	Marketing
	Phone Number	701-777-4419	701-777-2930
	e-mail	krista.lynn.minnotte@email.und.edu	maskim@business.und.edu

Section 1: Y Section 2: ? Section 3: NA Section 4: NA

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

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2010-2011 Annual Reports
UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Aviation **DATE** January 10, 2012

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Krista Lynn Minnotte and Mary Askim-Lovseth

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> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments:

Four student learning goals are referenced. The goals themselves (referred to as objectives) are somewhat vague and seem difficult to measure. However, the Aviation Department also provides a list of program outcomes, and these program outcomes are more easily measured. Additionally, these program outcomes are later in the assessment plan linked to the overall goals. It might be worthwhile to consider using the program outcomes as the student-learning goals, as the assessment plan is largely centered on measuring the outcomes. Moreover, the outcomes are generally well-articulated and having them serve as the student-learning goals of the program would likely result in a more straightforward assessment plan. It would, for example, eliminate the need for a two-page table in the assessment plan linking the outcomes to the objectives. We do recognize, however, that this might not be possible given the requirements of AABI.

As well as the four overall aviation program objectives, specific program outcomes are identified in the assessment plan for the following majors—commercial aviation, air traffic control, flight education, aviation management, and airport management (the latter two are BBA degrees granted out of the College of Business and Public Administration). The annual report focuses on the first three majors. All of these outcomes related to content and technical skills in the specific professional area. The assessment plan referenced is dated August 2008. No assessment plans are posted for the majors in aviation technology management and unmanned aircraft systems operations.

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) to identify UND/Essential Studies goals which are similar to the referenced departmental goals.

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

In the Aviation Department's assessment plan explicit connections are made between each ES goal and the intended outcomes of the Aviation Program. Additionally, the institutional goal of lifelong learning is reflected in the outcome of demonstrating that students have “a recognition of the need for, and an ability to engage in, life-long learning.” This institutional goal is also reflected in the educational objective of instilling characteristics that fully develop students' potential, as the assessment plan in describing this objective states “As a department, we seek to inspire graduates to continue along the path of lifelong learning.”

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____ NO____ QUALIFIED Y/N _X_

- Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach? YES_X_ NO____ QUALIFIED Y/N ____

Comments:

The assessment plan carefully describes which courses are expected to measure each outcome. The assessment plan also delineates a mixture of both direct and indirect methods that will be used to assess outcomes, but no linkage is made between each goal and the specific method that will be used to assess it. It is possible that such connections are made in the self-study that was mentioned in the annual report, but it is hard for outside readers to decipher these connections. The assessment plan and the assessment information contained in the annual report both mention the use of both direct and indirect measures of outcomes.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported? YES____ NO_X_ 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:

It appears that the department is actively engaged in assessment; however, the results are presented in a vague manner, making it difficult for outside readers to understand how the results demonstrate achievement of goals. Moreover, no specific results are reported. Instead, the results section of the report states that assessment occurred as a part of the self-study, at the individual course level, and through an alumni survey, FAA written test, stage check performances, the FAA evaluation of the air traffic control program, student focus groups, and student interviews. The results of these assessments are not reported nor are any direct linkages made between each assessment and the outcome it is intended to measure. It is possible that more detailed results are provided in the department’s self study. Including in future assessment reports a sample of a few findings that were particularly informative(with connections made between the findings and the goals the findings are intended to measure) would be helpful.

It was noted that two specific general outcomes were the foci for AY 2010-11; “make professional and ethical decisions,” and “engage in and recognize the need for life-long learning.” Discussion groups collected “a variety of additional assessments” and recommendations were presented to faculty, but no data were included.

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

- _____ 1 Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”)
- _____ 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)
- _____ 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage)
- _____ 4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”)
- _____ 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:

The results are not communicated in a detailed enough manner to ascertain how they connect with institutional and Essential Studies goals.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

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

YES_____ NO_____ QUALIFIED Y/N _X_

- 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:

The report lists a number of actions that were taken to improve the programs. However, it was unclear how these actions connect to assessment results as data was not provided.

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 Aviation Program appears to place a high value on assessment and to regularly engage in assessment activities. In assessing their outcomes they incorporate both direct and indirect methods. Some results should be reported and aligned with learning outcomes in order to determine the achievement of student learning.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

- ☒ Annual report
☐ Appendices (cited in annual report)
☐ Other (please describe)
☒ Assessment plan (as posted)
☒ Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	Krista Lynn Minnotte	Mary Askim-Lovseth
	Department	Sociology	Marketing
	Phone Number	701-777-4419	701-777-2930
	e-mail	krista.lynn.minnotte@email.und.edu	maskim@business.und.edu

Section 1: _Y_ Section 2: _?_ Section 3: _NA_ Section 4: _NA_

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