

**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**  
**Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-13 Annual Reports**  
**UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

DEPARTMENT Communications DATE April 7, 2014

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW B.A. with a major in Communication

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW *Casey Ozaki, Mary Askim-Lovseth, and Devon Hansen*

**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:*

The assessment plan for the B.A. in Communications was updated this year and adopted on October 1, 2013. As part of the plan's revision, the program developed a new mission statement and four new learning goals. The learning goals are much more succinct and focused than the previous goals from the 2007 assessment plan; they are an improvement on the previous goals.

Goal 4 would benefit from some additional specification. While the broader intent of wanting the student to apply learning to real-world professional environments is implied through the stated goal and associated rubric, more specific language would relate more directly to the assessment rubric associated with the goal and bring them into alignment.

In addition to the program 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 program 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”)  
       8 Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)

*Comments regarding program goals and alignment with institutional and Essential Studies goals:*

Many of UND's essential studies goals are addressed within program's learning goals and mission statement. Examples of commitment to these goals include:

**Mission:**

The mission of the Communication Program is to provide students with a broad understanding of human communication in various contexts, across diverse cultures, and through multiple systems. The Program engages students in lifelong learning that addresses socially and globally pressing communication challenges through scholarly, creative, critical, and practical curriculum and instruction.

1. Students will understand key foundational communication theories and best practices, and will be able to apply these concepts to scholarly and professional scenarios.

2. Students will become proficient in communicating critically, creatively, and ethically in diverse contexts and through multiple forms of media, including (though not limited to), written, oral, digital, and print-based communication.

3. Students will learn to conduct and report research in the broader discipline of Communication, including in (depending on courses/emphases taken:) journalism, digital communication, advertising, cultural, organizational, and health communication, public relations, speech communication, broadcasting, and other areas.

4. Students will demonstrate the knowledge they have acquired in their Communication coursework in an experiential learning environment, providing relevant and meaningful connections between their classroom work and the broader extended community.

## 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\_\_\_ NO\_\_X\_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N \_\_\_

### Comments:

Final projects from the program’s capstone course are used to assess Learning Goals 1-3 on a biennial basis. There are well-developed rubrics assigned to each of the goals to support assessment. In the alternate year, data for Learning Goal 4 is collected from student internship employers. The internship evaluations collect both qualitative and quantitative data for assessment. The learning goal and assessment rubric would benefit from more alignment; more specific goal language would support alignment.

While the assessment methods are clear and well-developed, they are direct measures of students’ abilities and skills. No indirect measures are indicated.

## 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\_\_\_ NO\_\_X\_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N \_\_\_
- If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement? YES\_\_\_ NO\_\_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N \_\_X\_\_
- Were the results tied to goals for student learning? YES\_\_X\_\_ NO\_\_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N \_\_\_

### Comments:

For this annual report, assessment data from 2012-13 related to Learning Goal 4 were reported. Aggregate scores and qualitative comments from student internship employers were presented in the areas of personal attributes, professional qualities, work effectiveness, and communication skills. Qualitative responses regarding the students’ strengths, areas of improvement, hire-ability, and met expectations were also reported.

While aggregate data were reported, analysis and findings of the data were not discussed. The annual review indicated that the faculty had a discussion about the strengths and weaknesses revealed by the data, but strengths were not reported.

In addition to program goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. Indicate any goals for which the program 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”)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 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 program, institutional, and Essential Studies goals:***

**The review reported assessment data for Learning Goal 4: Students will demonstrate the knowledge they have acquired in their Communication coursework in an experiential, learning environment, providing relevant and meaningful connections between their classroom work and the broader extended community. While a majority of the data focused on skills and abilities not listed as an Essential Studies goal, but the students’ Communication Skills are specifically assessed and evaluated by the employer.**

#### **4. CLOSING THE LOOP**

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

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO X 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:***

**Though there was indication that a discussion about the results was had among the faculty, the review reported that “no changes in curriculum and student-related departmental policies were suggested.”**

#### **SUMMARY**

##### ***Strengths***

- X A specific plan for assessment is in place.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Student learning goals are well-articulated.  
X Assessment methods are clearly described.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 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:**

Communication’s assessment plan was revised and improved within the last year. Learning goals are more specific and clearly relate to UND’s Essential Studies goals. In addition, a clear and do-able plan for the collection of assessment data is described and, based on the annual review, appears to be in place and enacted. Summary data collected within the last year for one of the learning goals is included in the annual review and accessible.

Three recommendations are provided. First, current assessment data comes solely from direct methods; introduction of indirect methods would enhance the program’s review of student learning. Second, while the review indicated that a discussion of strengths and weaknesses were had among the faculty, outcomes of that analysis were not reported. A short summary or specific points would continue to clarify their student learning assessment. Third, as stated in the review, Goal 4 would benefit from increased specification and alignment with the rubric.

#### **MATERIALS REVIEWED**

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

☒ Assessment plan (as posted)  
☒ Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	<i>Mary Askim-Lovseth</i>	<i>Devon Hansen</i>	<i>Casey Ozaki</i>
	Department	<i>Marketing</i>	<i>Geography</i>	<i>Teaching &amp; Learning</i>
	Phone Number	<i>7-2930</i>	<i>7-4587</i>	<i>7-4256</i>
	e-mail	<a href="mailto:maskim@business.und.edu">maskim@business.und.edu</a>	<a href="mailto:devon.hansen@und.edu">devon.hansen@und.edu</a>	<a href="mailto:carolyn.ozaki@und.edu">carolyn.ozaki@und.edu</a>

-----

Section 1: ☐ Y ☐ Q    Section 2: ☐ Y ☐ Q    Section 3: ☐ Y ☐ Q    Section 4: ☐ Y ☐ Q

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected and analyzed in other years)
- Q = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done
- N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA = no information reported and it's unclear whether it was done

*Revision 9/25/13*

**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**  
**Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-13 Annual Reports**  
**GRADUATE PROGRAMS**

**DEPARTMENT** Communications **DATE** April 7, 2014

**PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW** M.A. in Communication,

**COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW:** *Casey Ozaki, Mary Askim-Lovseth, and Devon Hansen*

**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:*

The assessment plan for Communication's M.A. in Communication degree was last updated in 2007. The goals for student learning fall into three areas: theory, research, and professional practice. Each area is accompanied by seven objectives that graduates with the degree are expected to demonstrate. The objectives are very specific and are generally concrete and measurable. Given that each objective should have a clear method of assessment, the department may want to assess the number of objectives and how much data would need to be collected to appropriately assess them. In addition, developing three overarching goals for each of the three areas would provide an coherence and generalized direction for each area.

**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>   </u> | NO <u>X</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:*

Direct and indirect assessment methods specific to the M.A. program are listed in the assessment plan. There are multiple methods listed for each approach including a portfolio, comprehensive exams, a thesis and presentation (Direct measures); and exit interviews/survey, survey of alumni, and employment placement analysis (Indirect measures).

The measures were not specifically aligned with particular goals. That said, clarifying which goals are aligned with which methods would enhance the plan. In addition, including the assessment instrument/tools (e.g., the assessment form used to provide the aggregate results reported).

**3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS**

- |  |                |               |                          |
|--|----------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| Were any assessment results reported?  | YES <u>   </u> | NO <u>   </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</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>X</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\_\_\_\_ NO\_\_\_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N \_X\_\_\_\_

**Comments:**

The program provided data from 2012-13 for five M.A. students, based on the three primary learning goal areas—theory, research, and practice. All but one of the students as excellent and very good across all three areas; this is all summative in nature. It cannot be discerned how well the students did regarding each objective. Based on the methods listed in the assessment plan, it is unclear which assignment(s) or assessment point(s) are being assessed to generate this data. The narrative states that the aggregate data is reported from an assessment form and that the advisors and students were instructed to collaboratively produce the evaluations through self-assessment and discussion. Please clarify what the form is assessing (e.g., what criteria is needed for an Excellent vs. Adequate for an MA student in the “Theory” area?) and how it aligns with the methods in the assessment plan.

#### 4. CLOSING THE LOOP

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

YES\_\_\_\_ NO\_X\_\_ 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:**

**Communications did not indicate a need for improvement or list any actions taken based on the assessment.**

#### 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 assessment plan lists specific learning objectives and specific methods are listed, but the objectives are not aligned. Give the number of objectives, aligned data collection may be overwhelming. We recommend that overarching goals be developed for theory, research and practice areas and be aligned with specific assessment methods. Data were reported for the M.A. program and indicates that students are learning at excellent and very good levels. Two recommendations are provided. First, while the data are presented, there is no indication that it was discussed by the faculty or linked to closing the loop. Some indication of discussed analysis would be insightful. Second, where the data is coming from is unclear and not obviously related to one of the methods from the assessment plan. The department updated the B.A. assessment plan in the last year; they are encouraged to do the same for the graduate assessment plan in the near future.

#### MATERIALS REVIEWED

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

- ☒ Assessment plan (as posted)
- ☒ Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	<i>Mary Askim-Lovseth</i>	<i>Devon Hansen</i>	<i>Casey Ozaki</i>
	Department	<i>Marketing</i>	<i>Geography</i>	<i>Teaching &amp; Learning</i>
	Phone Number	<i>7-2930</i>	<i>7-4587</i>	<i>7-4256</i>
	e-mail	<a href="mailto:maskim@business.und.edu"><u>maskim@business.und.edu</u></a>	<a href="mailto:devon.hansen@und.edu"><u>devon.hansen@und.edu</u></a>	<a href="mailto:carolyn.ozaki@und.edu"><u>carolyn.ozaki@und.edu</u></a>

---

Section 1: \_\_\_Y\_\_\_    Section 2: \_\_\_Q\_\_\_    Section 3: \_\_\_Q\_\_\_    Section 4: \_\_\_NA\_\_\_

**Coding Key:**

- Y    = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected in other years)
- Q    = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done
- N    = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA   = no information available and it's unclear whether it was done

*Revision 9/25/13*

**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**  
**Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-13 Annual Reports**  
**GRADUATE PROGRAMS**

**DEPARTMENT** Communications **DATE** April 7, 2014

**PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW** Ph.D in Communication,

**COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW:** *Casey Ozaki, Mary Askim-Lovseth, and Devon Hansen*

**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:*

The assessment plan for Communication's Ph.D in Communication degree was last updated in 2007. The goals for student learning fall into three areas: theory, research, and professional practice. Each area is accompanied by seven objectives that graduates with the degree are expected to demonstrate. The objectives are very specific and are generally concrete and measurable. Given that each objective should have a clear method of assessment, the department may want to assess the number of objectives and how much data would need to be collected to appropriately assess them. In addition, developing three overarching goals for each of the three areas would provide an coherence and generalized direction for each area.

**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>   </u> | NO <u>X</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:*

Direct and indirect assessment methods specific to the Ph.D program are listed in the assessment plan. There are multiple methods listed for each approach including a portfolio, comprehensive exams, a thesis and presentation (Direct measures); and exit interviews/survey, survey of alumni, and employment placement analysis (Indirect measures).

The measures were not specifically aligned with particular goals. That said, clarifying which goals are aligned with which methods would enhance the plan. In addition, including the assessment instrument/tools (e.g., the assessment form used to provide the aggregate results reported).

**3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS**

- |  |                |               |                          |
|--|----------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| Were any assessment results reported?  | YES <u>   </u> | NO <u>   </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</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>X</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\_\_\_\_ NO\_\_\_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N X\_\_\_\_

**Comments:**

The program provided data from 2012-13 for two Ph.D students, based on the three primary learning goal areas—theory, research, and practice. Both students scored as excellent across all three areas; this is all summative in nature. It cannot be discerned how well the students did regarding each objective. Based on the methods listed in the assessment plan, it is unclear which assignment(s) or assessment point(s) are being assessed to generate this data. The narrative states that the aggregate data is reported from an assessment form and that the advisors and students were instructed to collaboratively produce the evaluations through self-assessment and discussion. Please clarify what the form is assessing (e.g., what criteria is needed for an Excellent vs. Adequate for an Ph.D student in the “Theory” area?) and how it aligns with the methods in the assessment plan.

**4. CLOSING THE LOOP**

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

YES\_\_\_\_ NO X\_\_\_\_ 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:**

**Communications did not indicate a need for improvement or list any actions taken based on the assessment.**

**SUMMARY**

***Strengths***

***Areas for Improvement***

- X 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.
- 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 lists specific learning objectives and specific methods are listed, but the objectives are not aligned. Give the number of objectives, aligned data collection may be overwhelming. We recommend that overarching goals be developed for theory, research and practice areas and be aligned with specific assessment methods. Data were reported for the PH.D program and indicates that students are learning at excellent and very good levels. Two recommendations are provided. First, while the data are presented, there is no indication that it was discussed by the faculty or linked to closing the loop. Some indication of discussed analysis would be insightful. Second, where the data is coming from is unclear and not obviously related to one of the methods from the assessment plan. The department updated the B.A. assessment plan in the last year; they are encouraged to do the same for the graduate assessment plan in the near future.

**MATERIALS REVIEWED**

- X Annual report
- \_\_\_\_ Appendices (cited in annual report)
- \_\_\_\_ Other (please describe)

- X Assessment plan (as posted)
- X Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	<i>Mary Askim-Lovseth</i>	<i>Devon Hansen</i>	<i>Casey Ozaki</i>
	Department	<i>Marketing</i>	<i>Geography</i>	<i>Teaching &amp; Learning</i>
	Phone Number	7-2930	7-4587	7-4256
	e-mail	<a href="mailto:maskim@business.und.edu">maskim@business.und.edu</a>	<a href="mailto:devon.hansen@und.edu">devon.hansen@und.edu</a>	<a href="mailto:carolyn.ozaki@und.edu">carolyn.ozaki@und.edu</a>

---

Section 1: \_\_\_Y\_\_\_    Section 2: \_\_\_Q\_\_\_    Section 3: \_\_\_Q\_\_\_    Section 4: \_\_\_NA\_\_\_

**Coding Key:**

- Y    = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected in other years)
- Q    = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done
- N    = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA   = no information available and it's unclear whether it was done

*Revision 9/25/13*