

## UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2010-11 Annual Reports  
GRADUATE PROGRAMSDEPARTMENT MBA in Business and Public Administration DATE 5-4-12COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Joan Hawthorne, Barb Combs

## 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:*

*Goals are articulated in very concrete language, making it easy for faculty to determine the appropriate means of assessment – and for students to understand the bar which they are to reach.*

## 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>X</u>    | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |

*Comments:*

*If indirect assessment methods are used, it is difficult to see from either the plan or the annual assessment report. However, the direct assessment methods are not only appropriate but also clearly aligned with the intended learning outcomes. Faculty collect assessment information from a final-semester oral presentation made to a group of faculty and from materials students are required to collect (from specific courses) and save in a portfolio. The specific assignments to be saved and the oral presentation are mapped in direct alignment with learning outcomes. Except for objective 2.1 (which deals with oral presentation skills), each objective has at least two kinds of work products which will yield relevant data. This means that the faculty will have a very clear overview of student learning by the time analysis has been completed.*

*You might consider adding a bit of description of how information is gleaned from the work products collected in the portfolio – i.e., in a group reading using a rubric, via a rubric faculty complete when grading those specific products, or some other method?*

## 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 <u>X</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>X</u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |
| • Were the results tied to goals for student learning?   | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |

*Comments:*

*Data were collected based on the old plan since the new plan (including the portfolio) was recently implemented. However, some elements of the old plan were similar to those of the new – e.g., objectives were aligned with work products that were to be generated in specific courses and then assessed in relation to target achievement levels.*

*The report indicates that assessments from three different courses (Accounting 509, Economics 509, and Finance 501) were reviewed. Learning demonstrated in the Accounting and Finance courses (in alignment with the appropriate goals) was at or above target levels. In Economics, it was noted that 25% of the students fell short due to a limited background in the subject.*

*As part of the reporting of results, it would be helpful to see examples of some of the target levels in relation to achievement demonstrated – especially in any areas where achievement is noteworthy either because of particular excellence or particular concern. Examples make things much clearer for outside readers, although we don't necessarily expect that all data will be pasted into the annual report. (Sample data of this sort may have been available as an appendix which was referred to in the report, but, if so, that appendix was not retrievable via the website.)*

#### 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:*

*We note that the decision to go with a portfolio approach apparently grew out of a concern that isolated snapshot kinds of information was not adequate for understanding the learning of students in your graduate program – i.e., assessment results from previous assessment work.*

*Since the items in the portfolio are directly aligned with your individual goals, the portfolio plan will not only give you a fuller picture of each individual student (useful presumably for advising and mentorship), but will also be a tool which can be used to see what happens in relationship to your various learning outcomes over time – i.e., for an outcome which is measured in four different classes, will you find steady growth (across students) over time? It will be interesting to see what you learn from using this approach.*

*Of course, this loop-closing activity improves the assessment rather than the curriculum – and we look forward to future reports once you're far enough into the portfolio system to identify patterns in learning that speak to the curriculum itself.*

#### SUMMARY

##### *Strengths*

- ☒ X A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ☒ X Student learning goals are well-articulated.
- ☐ Assessment methods are clearly described.
- ☒ X Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
- ☐ Assessment methods are well-implemented.
- ☐ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
- ☒ X 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.
- ☒ X 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:

*We would strongly recommend adding a survey of some sort which requires students to assess their own level of competency on the learning outcomes you have identified. It would be especially interesting to use such a survey both in a first-semester course and near program completion (simply scoring oneself in terms of perceived competency + a rating system for level of perceived importance of the outcome, perhaps – with space for commentary if desired).*

*Although the new portfolio system represents a loop-closing on the old assessment work, we will be interested to find out what happens when you are far enough into the new system to be able to close the loop again (i.e., you should find out*

*whether this system is telling you “more,” whether the curriculum is working as you intend it to, whether there are specific outcomes for which learning demonstrated is regularly weaker than the others).*

*We’re glad to see continued emphasis on assessment for the MBA program*

## MATERIALS REVIEWED

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

Reviewer(s):	Name	Joan Hawthorne__	_Barb Combs__	_____
	Department	Academic Affairs_	_Teaching & Learning	_____
	Phone Number	7-4684_____	_7-2862_____	_____
	e-mail	joan.hawthorne@und.edu	_barbara.combs@und.edu	_____

-----

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