

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

DEPARTMENT Technology – M.S. Industrial Technology **DATE** 4/13/12

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Cassie Gerhardt & Eric Johnson

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 for the MSIT were not stated in the annual report, but were articulated in the department's posted assessment plan, dated November 2006. The assessment plan notes,

“By graduation, students should be able to:

1. Think critically and creatively;
2. Conduct research in industrial technology;
3. Prepare, present, and discuss research;
4. Discuss and apply technical management tools to solve problems;
5. Produce a body of research deemed publishable in appropriate professional contexts.”

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

Comments:

The assessment plan includes two tables: one that indicates the relationship of program goals to assessment methods utilized in individual courses and a second that indicates the relationship of program goals to assessment methods utilized with theses and independent studies. In addition the report notes a number of indirect assessment methods employed by the department (enrollment trends, graduation rates, etc.)

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> </u> | NO <u>X</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>X</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:

The department notes that four courses were assessed over the last two years and that, “students, depending on courses taken, and based upon their written work, appear to be adequately meeting all five program goals.” No specific evidence is provided to affirm achievement of goals or to indicate need for improvement. The reported results primarily address students’ written communication skills and suggest room for improvement.

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:

The report indicates that, "It was determined that more emphasis would be placed on improving writing in all areas of the graduate program using the developed rubric for written communication which was completed during the academic year (2010-11)." In addition, the department engaged in a curriculum mapping exercise in spring 2011, which resulted in a realignment of courses. The name of the program was changed from "Masters in Industrial Technology" to a "Masters in Technology." As a result, references to "Industrial" were removed from the program and more varied courses will eventually be offered to be of greater appeal to technologists (these changes will be sent to the relevant committees to be approved by spring 2012).

SUMMARY*Strengths**Areas for Improvement*

☒ 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.)

☐ 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 is encouraged to update the posted assessment plan which is dated November 2006. Assessment results should be reported in order to evaluate the degree to which the identified assessment methods have been implemented and to determine if results are used to inform curricular and/or other departmental changes.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

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

☒ Assessment plan (as posted)
☒ Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	<u>Cassie Gerhardt</u>	<u>Eric Johnson</u>
	Department	<u>Memorial Union</u>	<u>School of Law</u>
	Phone Number	<u>777-3667</u>	<u>777-2264</u>
	e-mail	<u>cassie.gerhardt@email.und.edu</u>	<u>eric.johnson@email.und.edu</u>

Section 1: Y Section 2: Y Section 3: ? 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

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in _2010-2011_ Annual Reports
UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT_BS in Industrial Tech. (BSIT) & BS in Graphic Design Tech. (BSGDT)**_DATE_**4/13/12**_**

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW_Cassie Gerhardt & Eric Johnson**_**

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:

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)
 X 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”)
 X 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:

The department has six stated learning goals relative to student learning. Within the department's goals are four that align with Essential Studies goals.

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

Comments:

The department's assessment plan includes a thorough outline of the specific methods used to assess students' achievement of the department's stated learning goals in the Senior Capstone Course. In addition, the department has mapped their courses in order to indicate in which courses specific learning outcomes will be directly assessed. Beyond direct assessment methods, the department has identified a number of indirect assessment methods (surveys, enrollment trends, etc.) as part of their comprehensive departmental assessment plan.

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__X__	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N ____

Comments:

The posted report includes results from a capstone survey, the Undergraduate Student Competencies Survey of Graduating Seniors which was completed by 26 students in Spring 2011. The survey addresses students' perceptions of their learning/preparation relative to the student learning goals of the capstone course. Student responses provide feedback as to whether students felt prepared, somewhat prepared, or not prepared regarding the specific learning goal.

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. .

- 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)
 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 results and the application of results to departmental, institutional and Essential Studies goals:

The capstone survey addresses the Essential Studies goals that are included in the department's 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 posted report indicates that the following changes have been made based on assessment results:

- **Continue the assessment timetable of evaluating all courses.**
- **Curriculum revisions.**
- **Faculty teaching evaluations are standard practice.**

The “closing the loop” activities reported do not directly address goals for student learning nor are they connected to the reported assessment results.

SUMMARY*Strengths**Areas for Improvement*

- ☒ 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.)

- ☐ 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's assessment plan was updated in March 2011 and includes well-articulated student learning goals. In addition, the plan highlights a variety of direct and indirect assessment methods used by the department to assess student learning. Based on the limited results provided in the report, it is difficult to determine if assessment methods are well-implemented. While "closing the loop" discussions appear to be part of the department's assessment culture, the reported results and changes do not provide evidence of a direct connection to student learning.

Based on the department's posted assessment plan and comments in the annual report - "The measures taken to educate faculty about assessment are beginning to pay off. Faculty are more willing to participate in assessment of student learning in their classes." - it is clear that the department has created a culture of assessment. The department is encouraged to include more results of their assessment activities in future reports, especially results related to the assessment 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	<u>Cassie Gerhardt</u>	<u>Eric Johnson</u>
	Department	<u>Memorial Union</u>	<u>School of Law</u>
	Phone Number	<u>777-3667</u>	<u>777-2264</u>
	e-mail	<u>cassie.gerhardt@email.und.edu</u>	<u>eric.johnson@email.und.edu</u>

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

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