

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2010-11 Annual Reports
UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT Marketing DATE February 9, 2012

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Joan Hawthorne, Sukhvarsh Jerath

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:

Marketing faculty have done a very detailed and clear job of articulating assessable goals.

In addition to the Departmental goals, please also consider UND's Institutional and Essential Studies goals for student learning (shown in alignment within parentheses) and identify which goals are similar to 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)
 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”)
 X 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 departmental goals and alignment of departmental goals with institutional and Essential Studies goals:

There is explicit alignment with the communication and critical thinking goals of the institution and the ES program. We noted that information literacy is not identified as an independent goal but is part of a scoring rubric used, which caused us to conclude that it is assessed as part of the communication goal.

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:

Excellent and varied methods of direct assessment have been planned and implemented. We did not see evidence of indirect assessment, but that would be easy to collect and might enhance what's learned through direct assessment.

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 ☒ NO ☐ QUALIFIED Y/N ☐

Comments:

The direct assessment collected speaks clearly to goals for learning and appears to have proven useful to the department.

In addition to departmental goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals.

Indicate any goals for which the department presents findings, and, for indicated items, describe findings 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:

Although scoring documents student achievement in all three areas checked, Marketing faculty believe student performance in oral communication should be stronger and they intend to work on that.

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:

It appears that individual faculty are making small changes in their own courses where appropriate, and faculty are working together on areas where they have identified greater need.

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:

With a single exception (it does not appear that indirect assessment is used – a relatively minor point), the Marketing Department is a model of good assessment practice and it was a pleasure to read about the work they have done in this most recent annual report.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

☒ Annual report
☐ Appendices (cited in annual report)
☐ Other (please describe)

☒ Assessment plan (as posted)
☒ Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	<u>Joan Hawthorne</u>	<u>Sukhvarsh Jerath</u>	_____
	Department	<u>Academic Affairs</u>	<u>Civil Engineering</u>	_____
	Phone Number	<u>7-4684</u>	<u>7-3564</u>	_____
	e-mail	<u>joan.hawthorne@und.edu</u>	<u>sukhvarsh.jerath@engr.und.edu</u>	_____

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 reported
- ? = action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done