Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2014 (Academic year)

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTN	MENT: Aviation DATE: May 5, 2015	i				
PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW: Aviation—Air Traffic Control (ATC)						
COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW: Casey Ozaki & Deborah Worley						
1. STUDEN	NT LEARNING GOALS					
•	Were any goals referenced? If so, were goals well-articulated? Do goals address student learning?	YES X YES X YES X	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N		
Comments:						
Education, Manageme each progre outcomes, of distinct from offerings for In addition to (shown in alX1	degree in Aerospace can be completed in multi- Unmanned Aircraft System Operations, and ant are also addressed, but are reviewed elso am and further aligned with the overall avi- and UND Essential Studies Outcomes (via a am one another programmatically, and clear for each program. The assessment plan is cut to the program goals, please also consider UND dignment within parentheses) and identify which a Communication – written or oral ("able to write." Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning. Information literacy ("be able to access and of Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of div Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifeld Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both regarding program goals and alignment with itemselved to AABI outcomes, which are mapped	ad Aviation Technewhere). Stude is it in program charts). In general articulate arrently under resistant speak in with a goals are similar ite and speak in with ite intellectually and ("apply empire evaluate for effects and use the long learning") for their community of the courses resistant and and all to the courses resistant on the courses resistant and all to the courses resistant on the courses resistant and all to the courses resistant on the courses resistant and all to the courses resistant on the courses resistant and all to the courses resistant and all the course resistant and all the courses resistant and all t	anology Mant learning objectives, ral the good in addition of the evision in the	anagement (Airport and Aviation a goals/outcomes are identified for accreditor (AABI) general als were focused on learning, on, the goals are mapped to cour response to AABI changes. Studies goals for student learning in goals. Ings with a sense of purpose/audience analyze, synthesize, evaluate) explore, discover, engage) analyze graphical information") tient, and ethical use") ding") In the world") It tudies goals: The major. It is evident that ES goals	n For esse e")	
	aroughout coursework and programs. For simple anto courses.	licity sake, it may	be useful t	o directly show how essential studie.	S	
2. ASSESS	MENT METHODS					
Were any sp	pecific assessment methods referenced? If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual					
•	goals? Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach?	YES_X YES_X				

Comments:

- 1) An assessment of the Stage Check Tasks (3 tasks) "unsatisfactory" rates across 5 courses. The 2014 data was compiled and will be compared to the 2015 data the following year. These tasks appear to be required by most if not all programs, but data is presented in aggregate and program-specific data is not provided.
- 2) Flight Course completion and incomplete rates across 7 courses—percentage rates are compared across four semester (two before & two after intervention) to demonstrate impact of intervention.
- 3) Comparison of final paper in Capstone course to examine writing ability—statistical analysis comparing mean scores across majors (Commercial Aviation, ATC, & UAS) and between 2013 and 2014. While all majors take this course only results reported for aforementioned 3 majors.
- 4) Student surveys, focus groups, and Course Annual Reports were also conducted.

The assessment plan indicates that ATC outcomes are only assessed by one technique (AT Basics Exam), but other areas of the plan and the assessment report indicate otherwise. You may want to re-evaluate that particular chart (Program Outcomes & Assessment Techniques) for ATC.

The focus of assessment appears to be outcome and technique driven (via schedule) and also based on areas that the faculty identify as needing more inquiry, indicating systemic and organic assessment practices. The focus on assessment techniques provides a cross-program assessment of student progress that allows for the identification of patterns that may exist for students throughout their shared curriculum and on particular outcomes/tasks. The drawback to this approach may be a lack of systemic inquiry into program-specific student performance and learning, unless specifically deemed needed (e.g., a choice to focus on the UAS in 2013-14).

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

Comments:

It is clear that the department is engaged in relevant and specific ongoing assessment. As mentioned previously, there is a "Techniques schedule" for assessment tasks in addition to ongoing departmental assessment activities (i.e., Course Annual Reports), but it is unclear based on the assessment plan and results if individual programs are assessed regularly or only as needed.

The final Capstone course assignment assessment (of writing) singled out Commercial Aviation, Air Traffic, Control and UAS for analysis. They examined mean scones between programs and for each program from 2013 to 2014. These are the only program-specific results provided in the annual report.

It appears that each of these tasks/courses are required for most, if not all, majors, but because the majority of the results are reported in aggregate, how students from specific programs performed is not identified (apart from Task #3). Therefore, the results reported may apply to ATC students and the information in the plan ties them back to the program outcomes, but this is not as clearly addressed in the discussion of the results.

Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning of Information literacy ("be able to access and evalued Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of diversity Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelong Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both for	and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience") intellectually curious"; analyze, synthesize, evaluate) in intellectually creative"; explore, discover, engage) ("apply empirical dataanalyze graphical information") atefor effective, efficient, and ethical use") by and use that understanding") glearning") their communities and for the world")				
Comments regarding results and the application of results to	o program, institutional, and Essential Studies goals:				
student scorese were compared to commercial aviation and Uperforming relatively consistently.	iting for all majors was conducted during this review period. ATC JAS and from 2013 to 2014. ATC students appear to be				
4. CLOSING THE LOOP					
Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported? • If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	YESXNO				
Comments: Actions were reported in regard to assessment across programs, but ATC specific program outcomes were not addressed. Given the aggregate nature of the assessment, changes likely affect ATC students, but this is not explicitly stated.					
SUMMARY					
SUMMARY Strengths	Areas for Improvement				
	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.)				
X A specific plan for assessment is in place. X Student learning goals are well-articulated. X Assessment methods are clearly described. X 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.) OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION From the materials provided, it is evident that systemic assess	No specific plan for assessment is in placeStudent learning goals are not well-articulatedAssessment methods are not clearly describedAssessment methods are not appropriately selectedAssessment methods are not well-implementedA single type of assessment methods predominatesNo results are reportedResults are not clearly tied to closing the loop(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.) DNS: sment is in place throughout the department and allows for inquiry int reviews are conducted at the program-level the aggregated grams (e.g., ATC, Commercial, Flight Education, etc. vs. all ince to disaggregating the data at the program level. Is there lee, could it be useful to look at program-specific (e.g., ATC)				
X A specific plan for assessment is in place. X Student learning goals are well-articulated. X Assessment methods are clearly described. X 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.) OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION From the materials provided, it is evident that systemic assessint of student performance and learning. Because the assessment results are difficult to interpret for individual program analysis that might be useful? For example students stage task performance? Specific to ATC, review the appropriate beyond what is currently identified.	No specific plan for assessment is in placeStudent learning goals are not well-articulatedAssessment methods are not clearly describedAssessment methods are not appropriately selectedAssessment methods are not well-implementedA single type of assessment methods predominatesNo results are reportedResults are not clearly tied to closing the loop(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.) DNS: sment is in place throughout the department and allows for inquiry int reviews are conducted at the program-level the aggregated grams (e.g., ATC, Commercial, Flight Education, etc. vs. all ince to disaggregating the data at the program level. Is there lee, could it be useful to look at program-specific (e.g., ATC)				

	us assessment review please describe)	
Reviewer(s):	Name Casey Ozaki Department Teaching & Learnin Phone Number 7-4256 e-mail carolyn.ozaki@und.	7-3140
Section 1: <u>Y</u>		: <u> Q</u>
Coding Key:		
Y		in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing tional kinds of data to be collected and analyzed in other
Q	• /	owever, evidence is lacking that this is completely and
N	= no, it is unclear whether it was done at all, or it	is not done in relationship to student learning

Revised Sept 24, 2014

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in _2013-14_____

GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT_Aviation	DAT	E_April 28,	2015
PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW _M.S. in A	viation		
COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVI	EW_Casey	Ozaki & Do	eborah Worley
1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS			
Were any goals referenced?If so, were goals well-articulated?Do goals address student learning?	YES_X YES_X YES_X	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N
Comments: The department assessment plan cites three goals for student lobjectives are generally well articulated and address student loabilities and instill a quest for life-long learning," seem to refl separating them. It appears that the assessment plan hasn't be plan in the near future.	earning. Goal lect two separ	l 2, "Develop ate objectives	a student's higher-order thinking . The program may want to consider
2. ASSESSMENT METHODS			
Were any specific assessment methods referenced? • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual	YES_X	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
goals?	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/NX
 Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach? 	YES_X	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
Comments: The department utilizes both direct and indirect assessment mobjectives. While seemingly appropriate for the goals & object learning goals.			
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? If so, were the results clear in terms of how 	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N _X_
they indicate need for improvement? • Were the results tied to goals for student	YES_X	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
learning?	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N _X_

Comments

Because of the relatively small number of students in the program, they assess their results every four years. The next review will be in 2015. The assessment results provided are from AY 2007-11, with the review having occurred in 2011. At that time, data from the student evaluations, alumni survey, and thesis/IS assessments were reviewed and areas for improvement identified. In addition, the thesis assessment rubrics from their 2013-14 rubrics were attached. The rubrics were developed to specifically address learning goals. That said, the discussion of the results specific to the learning goals stated were varied, and some connections were more easily seen than others.

	ns taken on the basis of as		v NO	QUALIFIED Y/N	
results reported? • If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?		improvements/ ment results			
u.	frectly address goals for su	udent learning? 1 ES_2	X NO_	QUALIFIED Y/N	
	curricular changes were marmal assessment in 2015.	ade to improve student learni	ng based on the 2	2007-11 data analysis. We look forward	
SUMMARY					
	Strengths		Areas	s for Improvement	
_XStudent _XAssessmeAssessmeAssessme _XDirect atResults an	fic plan for assessment is it learning goals are well-art nent methods are clearly do not methods are appropriate not methods are well-imple and indirect methods are im- e reported. are tied to closing the loop	iculated. Sescribed. Aby selected. Amented. Applemented. Applemented. Second Se	 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 S Overall the assorprevious review resulting from a	SUMMARY AND RECESSMENT plan, learning goal w (2007-11) were provided closing the loop. Given the rescheduled for 2015.	e.) (COMMENDATIONS: als, and methods are appropri d and demonstrate attention a	Decision-making iate and impleme and implementati	nted according to plan. Results from the	
OVERALL S Overall the asseprevious review resulting from available and a MATERIALS X Annua AnnualX AssessX Previo	SUMMARY AND RECESSMENT plan, learning goal w (2007-11) were provided closing the loop. Given the rescheduled for 2015. REVIEWED Il assessment report	e.) (COMMENDATIONS: als, and methods are appropri d and demonstrate attention a	Decision-making iate and impleme and implementati	nted according to plan. Results from the	

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, it is unclear whether it was done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning

 $\textbf{Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2014 \textit{(Academic year)}}$

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT: Aviation DATE: May 5, 2015			
PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW: Aviation-	—Commercia	al Aviation	(fixed wing & helicopter)
COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REV	IEW: Casey	Ozaki & I	Deborah Worley
1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS			
Were any goals referenced?If so, were goals well-articulated?Do goals address student learning?	YES X YES X YES X	NO NO NO	
Comments:			
A bachelors degree in Aerospace can be completed in multip Education, Unmanned Aircraft System Operations, and Management are also addressed, but are reviewed else each program and further aligned with the overall avia outcomes, and UND Essential Studies Outcomes (via che distinct from one another programmatically, and clear offerings for each program. The assessment plan is cure (shown in alignment within parentheses) and identify which gashed in addition to the program goals, please also consider UND's (shown in alignment within parentheses) and identify which gashed in a Communication – written or oral ("able to write to a complete to write to a complete to a com	A Aviation Technical Aviation Technical Aviation Program tharts). In general and articulate rently under resistivitional argoals are similare and speak in vibe intellectually ("apply empiry valuate for effects and use the inglearning") or their community or their community and the state of the state	hnology Ment learning objectives, eral the gode. In additional Essential arto program various setting curious"; ly creative"; rical dataafective, efficial understandities and formatical formatic	anagement (Airport and Aviation g goals/outcomes are identified for accreditor (AABI) general als were focused on learning, on, the goals are mapped to course response to AABI changes. Studies goals for student learning m goals. Ings with a sense of purpose/audience analyze, synthesize, evaluate) acceptore, discover, engage analyze graphical information and ethical use and ethical use are the world are the world.
Comments regarding program goals and alignment with ins ES goals are mapped to AABI outcomes, which are mapped tembedded throughout coursework and programs. For simplicates goals map onto courses.	to the courses r	equired in t	he major. It is evident that ES goals a
2. ASSESSMENT METHODS			
 Were any specific assessment methods referenced? If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual 	YES <u>X</u>	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
goals?	YES X	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
 Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach? 	YESX_	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N

Comments:

- 1) An assessment of the Stage Check Tasks (3 tasks) "unsatisfactory" rates across 5 courses. The 2014 data was compiled and will be compared to the 2015 data the following year. These tasks appear to be required by most if not all programs, but data is presented in aggregate and program-specific data is not provided.
- 2) Flight Course completion and incomplete rates across 7 courses—percentage rates are compared across four semester (two before & two after intervention) to demonstrate impact of intervention.
- 3) Comparison of final paper in Capstone course to examine writing ability—statistical analysis comparing mean scores across majors (Commercial Aviation, ATC, & UAS) and between 2013 and 2014. While all majors take this course only results reported for aforementioned 3 majors.
- 4) Student surveys, focus groups, and Course Annual Reports were also conducted.

The assessment plan indicates that Commercial Aviation outcomes are assessed by multiple techniques and this is implied in the annual report as well.

The focus of assessment appears to be outcome and technique driven (via schedule) and also based on areas that the faculty identify as needing more inquiry, indicating systemic and organic assessment practices. The focus on assessment techniques provides a cross-program assessment of student progress that allows for the identification of patterns that may exist for students throughout their shared curriculum and on particular outcomes/tasks. The drawback to this approach may be a lack of systemic inquiry into program-specific student performance and learning, unless specifically deemed needed (e.g., a choice to focus on the UAS in 2013-14).

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

Comments:

It is clear that the department is engaged in relevant and specific ongoing assessment. As mentioned previously, there is a "Techniques schedule" for assessment tasks in addition to ongoing departmental assessment activities (i.e., Course Annual Reports), but it is unclear based on the assessment plan and results if individual programs are assessed regularly or only as needed.

The final Capstone course assignment assessment (of writing) singled out Commercial Aviation, Air Traffic, Control and UAS for analysis. They examined mean scones between programs and for each program from 2013 to 2014. The annual reports also stated that the focus groups focused on the helicopter program (in addition to the living learning & UAS programs), but the results were not reported.

It appears that each of these tasks/courses are required for most, if not all, majors, but because the majority of the results are reported in aggregate, how students from specific programs performed is not identified (apart from Task #3). Therefore, the results reported may apply to Commercial Aviation students and the information in the plan ties them back to the program outcomes, but this is not as clearly addressed in the discussion of the results.

any goals for which the program presents findings, and, for X 1 Communication – written or oral ("able to wri 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or " 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or	te and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience") be intellectually curious"; analyze, synthesize, evaluate) "be intellectually creative"; explore, discover, engage) g ("apply empirical dataanalyze graphical information") uluatefor effective, efficient, and ethical use") sity and use that understanding") ong learning")
Comments regarding results and the application of results	s to program, institutional, and Essential Studies goals:
Commercial Aviation student scores were compared to con Aviation showed a significant increase in mean scores between	writing for all majors was conducted during this review period. mercial aviation and UAS and from 2013 to 2014. Commercial veen years.
4. CLOSING THE LOOP	
Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported? • If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	YES NO QUALIFIED Y/N YES NO QUALIFIED Y/NX
	rams, but Commercial Aviation specific program outcomes were not hanges likely affect these students, but this is not explicitly stated.
SUMMARY Strengths	Areas for Improvement
X A specific plan for assessment is in place. X_Student learning goals are well-articulated. X_Assessment methods are clearly described. X_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.)
into student performance and learning. Because the assessment results are difficult to interpret for individual pr Aviation majors). You may want to consider if there is rele	essment is in place throughout the department and allows for inquiry nent reviews are conducted at the program-level the aggregated ograms (e.g., ATC, Commercial, Flight Education, etc. vs. all vance to disaggregating the data at the program level. Is there uple, could it be useful to look at program-specific (e.g., ATC)
MATERIALS REVIEWED	

Other (p	lease describe)			
Reviewer(s):	Name Department Phone Number e-mail	Casey Ozaki Teaching & Learning 7-4256 carolyn.ozaki@und.edu	Deborah Worley Educational Leadership 7-3140 deborah.worley@und.edu	
Section 1: Y Coding Key:	Section 2:Y S	Section 3: Q Section 4: Q		
	•		aind the kind of program(s) reviewed and all kinds of data to be collected and analyze	

years)
Q = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and

appropriately done

N = no, it is unclear whether it was done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2014 (Academic year)

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT: Aviation DATE: May 5, 2015				
PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW: Aviation—	-Fligh	t Educ	ation	
COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVI	EW: (Casey ()zaki & D	eborah Worley
1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS				
Were any goals referenced?If so, were goals well-articulated?Do goals address student learning?	YES_ YES_ YES_	X		QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N
Comments:				
Education, Unmanned Aircraft System Operations, and Management are also addressed, but are reviewed elseweach program and further aligned with the overall aviation outcomes, and UND Essential Studies Outcomes (via che distinct from one another programmatically, and clear cofferings for each program. The assessment plan is currous finaddition to the program goals, please also consider UND's (shown in alignment within parentheses) and identify which go a light of the system o	where). ion products). In and arts institut coals are and sp be intell be intell ("apply aluate sity and g learning r their co	Studen ogram of general ander resional ander setually lectually empirition of the state of the s	nt learning objectives, ral the goad In addition evision in red Essential at to programations setting curious; and certive, efficit understandities and for the setting of the setting curious it understandities and for the setting curious it is the setting curious and the setting curious it is the setting curious and the setting curious curious curious and the setting curious c	a goals/outcomes are identified for accreditor (AABI) general als were focused on learning, and, the goals are mapped to course response to AABI changes. Studies goals for student learning a goals. The goals goals goals for student learning a goals. The goals goals goals for student learning a go
Comments regarding program goals and alignment with ins ES goals are mapped to AABI outcomes, which are mapped to embedded throughout coursework and programs. For simplic goals map onto courses.	the co	urses re	quired in th	e major. It is evident that ES goals are
2. ASSESSMENT METHODS				
 Were any specific assessment methods referenced? If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual 	YES_	X	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
goals? • Were both direct and indirect assessment	YES_	X	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N
methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach?	YES_	X	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N

Comments:

- 1) An assessment of the Stage Check Tasks (3 tasks) "unsatisfactory" rates across 5 courses. The 2014 data was compiled and will be compared to the 2015 data the following year. These tasks appear to be required by most if not all programs, but data is presented in aggregate and program-specific data is not provided.
- 2) Flight Course completion and incomplete rates across 7 courses—percentage rates are compared across four semester (two before & two after intervention) to demonstrate impact of intervention.
- 3) Comparison of final paper in Capstone course to examine writing ability—statistical analysis comparing mean scores across majors (Commercial Aviation, ATC, & UAS) and between 2013 and 2014. While all majors take this course only results reported for aforementioned 3 majors.
- 4) Student surveys, focus groups, and Course Annual Reports were also conducted.

The assessment plan indicates that Flight Education outcomes are assessed by multiple techniques and this appears to be implied in the annual report as well.

The focus of assessment appears to be outcome and technique driven (via schedule) and also based on areas that the faculty identify as needing more inquiry, indicating systemic and organic assessment practices. The focus on assessment techniques provides a cross-program assessment of student progress that allows for the identification of patterns that may exist for students throughout their shared curriculum and on particular outcomes/tasks. The drawback to this approach may be a lack of systemic inquiry into program-specific student performance and learning, unless specifically deemed needed (e.g., a choice to focus on the UAS in 2013-14).

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

Comments:

It is clear that the department is engaged in relevant and specific ongoing assessment. As mentioned previously, there is a "Techniques schedule" for assessment tasks in addition to ongoing departmental assessment activities (i.e., Course Annual Reports), but it is unclear based on the assessment plan and results if individual programs are assessed regularly or only as needed.

It appears that each of these tasks/courses are required for most, if not all, majors, but because the majority of the results are reported in aggregate, how students from specific programs performed is not identified (apart from Task #3). Therefore, the results reported may apply to Flight Education students and the information in the plan ties them back to the program outcomes, but this is not as clearly addressed in the discussion of the results.

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 dataanalyze graphical information")

6 Div	5 Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluatefor 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 reg	arding results and the appli	cation of results to progra	m, institutional,	and Essential Studies goals:			
	oort indicates that an assessn ht Education students were i		all majors was co	onducted during this review period, but			
4. CLOSING	THE LOOP						
results reported • If	ns taken on the basis of asse d? Fso, do curricular or other in nanges arising from assessmi irectly address goals for stud	YES nprovements/ ent results	X NO	QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/NX			
				specific program outcomes were not udents, but this is not explicitly stated.			
SUMMARY	Strengths		Areas	for Improvement			
X_A specific plan for assessment is in placeX_Student learning goals are well-articulatedX_Assessment methods are clearly describedX_Assessment methods are appropriately selectedAssessment methods are well-implementedDirect and indirect methods are implementedResults are reportedResults are tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is tied to evidence.) No specific plan for assessment is in placeStudent learning goals are not well-articulatedAssessment methods are not clearly describedAssessment methods are not appropriately selectedAssessment methods are not well-implementedA single type of assessment methods predominatesNo results are reportedResults are not clearly tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)							
OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS: From the materials provided, it is evident that systemic assessment is in place throughout the department and allows for inquiry into student performance and learning. Because the assessment reviews are conducted at the program-level the aggregated assessment results are difficult to interpret for individual programs (e.g., ATC, Commercial, Flight Education, etc. vs. all Aviation majors). You may want to consider if there is relevance to disaggregating the data at the program level. Is there individual program analysis that might be useful? For example, could it be useful to look at program-specific (e.g., ATC) students stage task performance?							
MATERIALS	REVIEWED						
X Annual F X Assessm X Previou	assessment report Report (2012, 2013) nent plan (as posted)(including assessment review blease describe)	ng 2005 plan)					
Reviewer(s):	Name Department Phone Number e-mail	Casey Ozaki Teaching & Learning 7-4256 carolyn.ozaki@und.edu	Deborah World Educational Le 7-3140 deborah.worley	eadership			

Section 1: _	Y	Section 2: Y	Section 3: Q	Section 4: 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, it is unclear whether it was done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2014 (Academic year)

<u>UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS</u>

DEPART	MENT: Joint CoBPA & JDOSAS	DATE: Ap	oril 21, 2015	5
PROGRA	M(S) COVERED IN REVIEW: Aviation M	Managemen	t	
COMMIT	TEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVI	EW: Bradlo	ey Myers &	Devon Hansen
1. STUDE	NT LEARNING GOALS			
•	Were any goals referenced? If so, were goals well-articulated? Do goals address student learning?	YES X YES X YES X	NO NO NO	QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N
the Odegard Managemer common lea of courses a Although th use of an "a reports mad	in Aviation Management is offered as a joint prog I School of Aerospace Studies. A singular assessment majors with 3 common learning goals and one surning objectives and 3 learning objectives for the notal assessment methods that should be used to gather plan purports to provide a system that will alloc seessment team," it does not appear as if that plan e by the Management department of the CoBPA rehool and are being used there," but no such assess	nent plan exist eparate learni Aviation Mar her information ate to the oblide has been followers that "A	is for both the ng goal for ea nagement majon on specific gation for assowed in this reviation-related	e Airport Management and Aviation ach major. The plan identifies seven for. The plan contains an extensive list elearning objectives sessment to the colleges through the regard. Each of the last three annual ed data[sic] were collected in the
(shown in a1234X567	to the program goals, please also consider UND's lignment within parentheses) and identify which g Communication – written or oral ("able to write a Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "b Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluative Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of diversit Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelong Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both for	goals are simily and speak in varietiectually e intellectually e intellectually "apply empiriatefor effecty and use that g learning")	ar to program arious setting curious"; an y creative"; e ical dataan tive, efficient understandir	n goals. s with a sense of purpose/audience") alyze, synthesize, evaluate) explore, discover, engage) alyze graphical information") t, and ethical use") ng")
Both critica	regarding program goals and alignment with ins I and creative thinking also appear to be necessary ecifically identified as learning objectives.			
2. ASSESS	SMENT METHODS			
Were any sp	Decific assessment methods referenced? If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual	YES	NO <u>X</u>	QUALIFIED Y/N
	goals?	YES	NO_X_	QUALIFIED Y/N
•	Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach?	YES	NO_X_	QUALIFIED Y/N

Comments:

Although the plan identifies potential assessment methods that could be used in specifically identified course, it does not appear that any of the methods have been conducted in recent years. The Management department reports that it administered the Survey of Student Perception of Skills Improved, but says that the number of respondents form the major were "too small to be useful in drawing inferences.

3	ASSESSN	TENT	RESIII	TC

Were any assessment results reported?	YES	NO_X_	QUALIFIED Y/N	
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how	VEC	NO V		
they specifically affirm achievement of goals?If so, were the results clear in terms of how	YES	NO_X_	QUALIFIED Y/N	
they indicate need for improvement?	YES	NO_X_	QUALIFIED Y/N	
• Were the results tied to goals for student learning?	YES	NO_X	QUALIFIED Y/N	
Comments:				
In addition to program goals, some assessment results may be any goals for which the program presents findings, and, for 1 Communication – written or oral ("able to write 2 Thinking and researing — critical thinking (or ")	indicated ite and speak ir	ms, describe fi n various settin	ndings below. gs with a sense of purpose/audience")	
2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "by a Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "by a Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning – some standard of the standard of	be intellectured ("apply employems) that it is a second to be sittle and use the sittle a	nally creative"; pirical dataa fective, efficie hat understand	explore, discover, engage) nalyze graphical information") nt, and ethical use") ing")	
Comments regarding results and the application of results	to program,	institutional,	and Essential Studies goals:	
4. CLOSING THE LOOP				
Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?	YES	NOX	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:				
SUMMARY				
Strengths		Areas	for Improvement	
X A specific plan for assessment is in placeStudent learning goals are well-articulated.	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:

It appears that assessment of student learning in the department has fallen through the cracks. The most likely explanation for this is that fact that no one department has sole responsibility for assessing student learning. While the vision of the plan that the Management Department and the Odegard School would take responsibility for assessing the learning objectives tied to their disciplines appears sound, it is apparent that a single party should have the obligation to collect, evaluate report the assessment results.

MATERIAL	S REVIEWED		
X Annual X Assess Previous	l assessment report Report (2012, 2013) ment plan (as posted)(inclus as assessment review (please describe)	ding 2005 plan)	
Reviewer(s):	Name Department Phone Number e-mail	Bradley Myers Law School 7-2228 myers@law.und.edu	Devon Hansen Geography 7-4587 devon.hansen@und.edu
Section 1:	Section 2: Q Se	ction 3: N Section 4:	<u>N</u>
Coding Key: Y			mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing nal kinds of data to be collected and analyzed in other
Q		or progress is apparent; how	ever, evidence is lacking that this is completely and
N		er it was done at all, or it is r	ot done in relationship to student learning

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2014 (Academic year)

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTN	MENT: Aviation DATE: May 5, 2015				
PROGRA	M(S) COVERED IN REVIEW: Aviation	—Unmanned	Aircraft S	Systems (UAS)	
COMMIT	TEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REV	VIEW: Casey	Ozaki & I	Deborah Worley	
1. STUDEN	NT LEARNING GOALS				
•	Were any goals referenced? If so, were goals well-articulated? Do goals address student learning?	YES X YES X YES X		QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/N	
Comments:					
Education, Managemente each progression of the contents of the	degree in Aerospace can be completed in multipul Unmanned Aircraft System Operations, and it are also addressed, but are reviewed elso am and further aligned with the overall avidand UND Essential Studies Outcomes (via common enother programmatically, and clean or each program. The assessment plan is cut to the program goals, please also consider UND ignment within parentheses) and identify which Communication – written or oral ("able to write Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning 5 Information literacy ("be able to access and established Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of diversity ("individual commit themselves to lifeld Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both in the common of the commit themselves to lifeld Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both in the common of the commit themselves to lifeld Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both in the common of the commit themselves to lifeld Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both in the common of the commit themselves to lifeld Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both in the common of the commit themselves to lifeld Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both in the common of	d Aviation Techewhere). Stude ation program charts). In general and articulate rrently under results are similar to and speak in which intellectually ("apply empire evaluate for effects and use the ong learning") for their communications.	chnology Ment learning objectives, eral the good of the evision in the description of the evision in the evisio	anagement (Airport and Aviation of goals/outcomes are identified for accreditor (AABI) general als were focused on learning, on, the goals are mapped to cours response to AABI changes. Studies goals for student learning on goals. Ings with a sense of purpose/audience analyze, synthesize, evaluate) (explore, discover, engage) (explore, discover, engage) (explore, and ethical use") (explore, and ethical use") (explore, and ethical use") (explore, discover, engage) (explore, and ethical use") (explore, and explore, and ethical use") (explore, and ethical us	e or se
ES goals are embedded th	regarding program goals and alignment with in e mapped to AABI outcomes, which are mapped aroughout coursework and programs. For simpl anto courses.	to the courses r	equired in t	he major. It is evident that ES goals	
2. ASSESS	MENT METHODS				
Were any sp	recific assessment methods referenced? If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual	YES_X_	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N	
•	goals? Were both direct and indirect assessment		NO	QUALIFIED Y/N	
•	methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach?	YESX_	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N	

Comments:

- 1) An assessment of the Stage Check Tasks (3 tasks) "unsatisfactory" rates across 5 courses. The 2014 data was compiled and will be compared to the 2015 data the following year. These tasks appear to be required by most if not all programs, but data is presented in aggregate and program-specific data is not provided.
- 2) Flight Course completion and incomplete rates across 7 courses—percentage rates are compared across four semester (two before & two after intervention) to demonstrate impact of intervention.
- 3) Comparison of final paper in Capstone course to examine writing ability—statistical analysis comparing mean scores across majors (Commercial Aviation, ATC, & UAS) and between 2013 and 2014. While all majors take this course only results reported for aforementioned 3 majors.
- 4) Student surveys, focus groups, and Course Annual Reports were also conducted.

The assessment plan indicates that UAS outcomes are assessed by multiple techniques and this is implied in the annual report as well.

The focus of assessment appears to be outcome and technique driven (via schedule) and also based on areas that the faculty identify as needing more inquiry, indicating systemic and organic assessment practices. The focus on assessment techniques provides a cross-program assessment of student progress that allows for the identification of patterns that may exist for students throughout their shared curriculum and on particular outcomes/tasks. The drawback to this approach may be a lack of systemic inquiry into program-specific student performance and learning, unless specifically deemed needed (e.g., a choice to focus on the UAS in 2013-14).

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

Comments:

It is clear that the department is engaged in relevant and specific ongoing assessment. As mentioned previously, there is a "Techniques schedule" for assessment tasks in addition to ongoing departmental assessment activities (i.e., Course Annual Reports), but it is unclear based on the assessment plan and results if individual programs are assessed regularly or only as needed.

The final Capstone course assignment assessment (of writing) singled out Commercial Aviation, Air Traffic, Control and UAS for analysis. They examined mean scones between programs and for each program from 2013 to 2014.

It appears that each of these tasks/courses are required for most, if not all, majors, but because the majority of the results are reported in aggregate, how students from specific programs performed is not identified (apart from Task #3). Therefore, the results reported may apply to Commercial Aviation students and the information in the plan ties them back to the program outcomes, but this is not as clearly addressed in the discussion of the results.

	ite and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audien
	'be intellectually curious"; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)
3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or	
	ng ("apply empirical dataanalyze graphical information")
5 Information literacy ("be able to access and ev	aluatefor effective, efficient, and ethical use")
6 Diversity ("demonstrate understanding of dive 7 Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifel	rsity and use that understanding")
8 Service/citizenship ("share responsibility both	
Comments regarding results and the application of result	
Commercial Aviation student scores were compared to Co	writing for all majors was conducted during this review period. mmercial Aviation and UAS and from 2013 to 2014. UAS mean the program indicated that they will conduct follow-up in 2014-
4. CLOSING THE LOOP	
Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment	VEC V NO QUALIFIED VAI
results reported?	YESX_ 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 _X_
, ,	
Given the aggregate nature of the assessment, changes like	ely affect these students, but this is not explicitly stated. In addit nistered and a review of the results led the faculty to determine
Actions were reported in regard to assessment across prog Given the aggregate nature of the assessment, changes like the bi-annual student surveys and focus groups were admi	ely affect these students, but this is not explicitly stated. In addit nistered and a review of the results led the faculty to determine
Actions were reported in regard to assessment across prog Given the aggregate nature of the assessment, changes like the bi-annual student surveys and focus groups were admi an extensive UAS program review was needed and is being	grams, but UAS specific program outcomes were not addressed. ely affect these students, but this is not explicitly stated. In addit nistered and a review of the results led the faculty to determine g conducted in the 2014-15 year. Areas for Improvement
Actions were reported in regard to assessment across prog Given the aggregate nature of the assessment, changes like the bi-annual student surveys and focus groups were admi an extensive UAS program review was needed and is being SUMMARY Strengths	ely affect these students, but this is not explicitly stated. In addit nistered and a review of the results led the faculty to determine g conducted in the 2014-15 year. Areas for Improvement
Actions were reported in regard to assessment across prog Given the aggregate nature of the assessment, changes like the bi-annual student surveys and focus groups were admit an extensive UAS program review was needed and is being SUMMARY Strengths X A specific plan for assessment is in place.	ely affect these students, but this is not explicitly stated. In additional nistered and a review of the results led the faculty to determine a conducted in the 2014-15 year. Areas for Improvement No specific plan for assessment is in place.
Actions were reported in regard to assessment across prog Given the aggregate nature of the assessment, changes like the bi-annual student surveys and focus groups were admi an extensive UAS program review was needed and is being SUMMARY Strengths	ely affect these students, but this is not explicitly stated. In addit nistered and a review of the results led the faculty to determine g conducted in the 2014-15 year. Areas for Improvement
Actions were reported in regard to assessment across prog Given the aggregate nature of the assessment, changes like the bi-annual student surveys and focus groups were admit an extensive UAS program review was needed and is being SUMMARY Strengths X A specific plan for assessment is in place. X Student learning goals are well-articulated. X Assessment methods are clearly described. X Assessment methods are appropriately selected.	ely affect these students, but this is not explicitly stated. In addit nistered and a review of the results led the faculty to determine a conducted in the 2014-15 year. Areas for Improvement No specific plan for assessment is in place Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
Actions were reported in regard to assessment across prog Given the aggregate nature of the assessment, changes like the bi-annual student surveys and focus groups were admit an extensive UAS program review was needed and is being SUMMARY Strengths X A specific plan for assessment is in place. X Student learning goals are well-articulated. X Assessment methods are clearly described. X Assessment methods are appropriately selected. Assessment methods are well-implemented.	ely affect these students, but this is not explicitly stated. In additional numbers of the results led the faculty to determine a conducted in the 2014-15 year. 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.
Actions were reported in regard to assessment across prog Given the aggregate nature of the assessment, changes like the bi-annual student surveys and focus groups were admit an extensive UAS program review was needed and is being SUMMARY Strengths X A specific plan for assessment is in place. X Student learning goals are well-articulated. X Assessment methods are clearly described. X Assessment methods are appropriately selected. Assessment methods are well-implemented. Direct and indirect methods are implemented.	Areas for Improvement No specific plan for assessment is in place. Student learning goals are not well-articulated. Assessment methods are not well-implemented. Assessment methods are not well-implemented. Asingle type of assessment methods predominates.
Actions were reported in regard to assessment across prog Given the aggregate nature of the assessment, changes like the bi-annual student surveys and focus groups were admit an extensive UAS program review was needed and is being SUMMARY Strengths X A specific plan for assessment is in place. X Student learning goals are well-articulated. X Assessment methods are clearly described. X Assessment methods are appropriately selected. Assessment methods are well-implemented. Direct and indirect methods are implemented. Results are reported.	Areas for Improvement No specific plan for assessment is in place. Student learning goals are not well-articulated. Assessment methods are not appropriately selected. Assessment methods are not well-implemented. Asingle type of assessment methods predominates. No results are reported.
Actions were reported in regard to assessment across prog Given the aggregate nature of the assessment, changes like the bi-annual student surveys and focus groups were admit an extensive UAS program review was needed and is being SUMMARY Strengths X A specific plan for assessment is in place. X Student learning goals are well-articulated. X Assessment methods are clearly described. X 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.	Areas for Improvement No specific plan for assessment is in place. Student learning goals are not well-articulated. Assessment methods are not appropriately selected. Assessment methods are not well-implemented. Results are reported. Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
Actions were reported in regard to assessment across prog Given the aggregate nature of the assessment, changes like the bi-annual student surveys and focus groups were admit an extensive UAS program review was needed and is being SUMMARY Strengths X A specific plan for assessment is in place. X Student learning goals are well-articulated. X Assessment methods are clearly described. X Assessment methods are appropriately selected. Assessment methods are well-implemented. Direct and indirect methods are implemented. Results are reported.	Areas for Improvement No specific plan for assessment is in place. Student learning goals are not well-articulated. Assessment methods are not appropriately selected. Assessment methods are not well-implemented. Asingle type of assessment methods predominates. No results are reported.
Actions were reported in regard to assessment across prog Given the aggregate nature of the assessment, changes like the bi-annual student surveys and focus groups were admit an extensive UAS program review was needed and is being SUMMARY Strengths X A specific plan for assessment is in place. X Student learning goals are well-articulated. X Assessment methods are clearly described. X 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 appropriately selected. Assessment methods are not well-implemented. Assessment methods are not well-implemented. Assigle 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.)
Actions were reported in regard to assessment across prog Given the aggregate nature of the assessment, changes like the bi-annual student surveys and focus groups were admit an extensive UAS program review was needed and is being SUMMARY Strengths X A specific plan for assessment is in place. X Student learning goals are well-articulated. X Assessment methods are clearly described. X 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.) OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDAT	Areas for Improvement No specific plan for assessment is in place. Student learning goals are not well-articulated. Assessment methods are not appropriately selected. Assessment methods are not well-implemented. Assessment methods are not well-implemented. Assessment methods are not well-implemented. Assingle 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.)
Actions were reported in regard to assessment across prog Given the aggregate nature of the assessment, changes like the bi-annual student surveys and focus groups were admit an extensive UAS program review was needed and is being SUMMARY Strengths X A specific plan for assessment is in place. X Student learning goals are well-articulated. X Assessment methods are clearly described. X 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.) OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDAT From the materials provided, it is evident that systemic assessments.	Areas for Improvement No specific plan for assessment is in place. Student learning goals are not well-articulated. Assessment methods are not appropriately selected. Assessment methods are not well-implemented. Assessment methods are not well-implemented. Assessment methods are not well-implemented. Assigle 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.)
Actions were reported in regard to assessment across prog Given the aggregate nature of the assessment, changes like the bi-annual student surveys and focus groups were admit an extensive UAS program review was needed and is being SUMMARY Strengths X A specific plan for assessment is in place. X Student learning goals are well-articulated. X Assessment methods are clearly described. X 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.) OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDAT From the materials provided, it is evident that systemic assinquiry into student performance and learning. Because the	Areas for Improvement No specific plan for assessment is in place. Student learning goals are not well-articulated. Assessment methods are not appropriately selected. Assessment methods are not well-implemented. Assingle 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.) CIONS: Sessment is in place throughout the department and allows for the assessment reviews are conducted at the program-level the
Actions were reported in regard to assessment across prog Given the aggregate nature of the assessment, changes like the bi-annual student surveys and focus groups were admit an extensive UAS program review was needed and is being SUMMARY Strengths X A specific plan for assessment is in place. X Student learning goals are well-articulated. X Assessment methods are clearly described. X 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.) OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDAT From the materials provided, it is evident that systemic assinquiry into student performance and learning. Because the aggregated assessment results are difficult to interpret for	Areas for Improvement No specific plan for assessment is in place. Student learning goals are not well-articulated. Assessment methods are not appropriately selected. Assessment methods are not well-implemented. Assingle 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.) TIONS: Seessment is in place throughout the department and allows for the assessment reviews are conducted at the program-level the individual programs (e.g., ATC, Commercial, Flight Education)
Actions were reported in regard to assessment across prog Given the aggregate nature of the assessment, changes like the bi-annual student surveys and focus groups were admit an extensive UAS program review was needed and is being SUMMARY Strengths X A specific plan for assessment is in place. X Student learning goals are well-articulated. X Assessment methods are clearly described. X 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.) OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDAT From the materials provided, it is evident that systemic assinquiry into student performance and learning. Because the aggregated assessment results are difficult to interpret for vs. all Aviation majors). You may want to consider if there	Areas for Improvement Areas for Improvement No specific plan for assessment is in place. Student learning goals are not well-articulated. Assessment methods are not appropriately selected. Assessment methods are not well-implemented. Assessment methods are not well-implemented. Assessment methods are not directly described. Assessment methods are not well-implemented. Assingle 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.) TIONS: Sessment is in place throughout the department and allows for the assessment reviews are conducted at the program-level the individual programs (e.g., ATC, Commercial, Flight Education is relevance to disaggregating the data at the program level. Is
Actions were reported in regard to assessment across prog Given the aggregate nature of the assessment, changes like the bi-annual student surveys and focus groups were admit an extensive UAS program review was needed and is being SUMMARY Strengths X A specific plan for assessment is in place. X Student learning goals are well-articulated. X Assessment methods are clearly described. X 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.) OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDAT From the materials provided, it is evident that systemic assinquiry into student performance and learning. Because the aggregated assessment results are difficult to interpret for vs. all Aviation majors). You may want to consider if there	Areas for Improvement No specific plan for assessment is in place. Student learning goals are not well-articulated. Assessment methods are not appropriately selected. Assessment methods are not well-implemented. Assingle 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.) CIONS: Sessment is in place throughout the department and allows for the assessment reviews are conducted at the program-level the

X Assessn	nent plan (as posted)(including 2005 plan)	
	as assessment review	
Other (1	please describe)	
	,	
Reviewer(s):	Name Casey Ozaki	Deborah Worley
(4)	Department Teaching & Learning	Educational Leadership
	Phone Number 7-4256	7-3140
	e-mail carolyn.ozaki@und.edu	
Section 1: Y	Section 2: Y Section 3: Q Section 4:_	0
Section 1. <u>1</u>	Section 2 Section 3 Section 4	<u>×</u>
Coding Key:		
Y	= yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in	mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing
		nal kinds of data to be collected and analyzed in other
	years)	•
Q	= qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; how	ever, evidence is lacking that this is completely and
	appropriately done	
N	= no, it is unclear whether it was done at all, or it is n	ot done in relationship to student learning

Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2014 (Academic year)

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPART	MENT: Aviation	DATE: May 5, 201	5			
PROGRA	M(S) COVERED I	N REVIEW: Aviatio	nAviation	Technology	Management (ATM)	
СОММІТ	TEE MEMBER(S)	CONDUCTING RE	VIEW: Ca	sey Ozaki &	Deborah Worley	
1. STUDE	NT LEARNING GOA	ALS				
•	Were any goals refer If so, were goals wel Do goals address stud	l-articulated?	YES YES YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N _X_ QUALIFIED Y/N _X_ QUALIFIED Y/N _X_	
Comments:						
Manageme each progr outcomes, distinct fro offerings fo	ent are also addresse ram and further align and UND Essential S om one another progr or each program.	d, but are reviewed el. ned with the overall av Studies Outcomes (via cammatically, and cled	sewhere). S viation prog charts). In ur and articu	tudent learni. ram objective general the gu ulate. In addi	Management (Airport and Aving goals/outcomes are identified, accreditor (AABI) general pals were focused on learning tion, the goals are mapped to	fied for g, course
learning go goals/obje on a singu	oals or assessment p ctives still need to be	lans. Since that time th developed for the Avi	he assessme ation Techn	nt plan has be ology Progra	and UAS programs did not ho een updated (2013) and speci m (note: that is one outcome nent plan is currently under t	fic listed
(shown in a1234567	lignment within parent Communication – writ Thinking and reasonin Thinking and reasonin Thinking and reasonin Information literacy ("I Diversity ("demonstrat Lifelong learning ("co	heses) and identify whic ten or oral ("able to writ g – critical thinking (or g – creative thinking (or	th goals are size and speak if the intellecture of the intellectur	milar to programilar to program various setting ally curious"; and curious and	ngs with a sense of purpose/audi analyze, synthesize, evaluate) (explore, discover, engage) analyze graphical information") nt, and ethical use")	
	nere is no consistent ou	als and alignment with tcomes related to this pro-			Studies goals: ppears to be focused on knowle	dge
2. ASSESS	SMENT METHODS					
Were any sp	pecific assessment met. If so, were specifical methods appropriatel goals?		YES <u>X</u> ul YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N QUALIFIED Y/NX	

•	Were both direct and indirect assessment			
	methods used as components of a "multiple	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/NX
	measures" approach?			

Comments:

The department reported method/results related to three assessment tasks they undertook in the 2013-14 year:

- 1) An assessment of the Stage Check Tasks (3 tasks) "unsatisfactory" rates across 5 courses. The 2014 data was compiled and will be compared to the 2015 data the following year. These tasks appear to be required by most if not all programs, but data is presented in aggregate and program-specific data is not provided.
- 2) Flight Course completion and incomplete rates across 7 courses—percentage rates are compared across four semester (two before & two after intervention) to demonstrate impact of intervention.
- 3) Comparison of final paper in Capstone course to examine writing ability—statistical analysis comparing mean scores across majors (Commercial Aviation, ATC, & UAS) and between 2013 and 2014. While all majors take this course only results reported for aforementioned 3 majors.
- 4) Student surveys, focus groups, and Course Annual Reports were also conducted.

Methods discussed in the assessment plan and reported on the annual reports are varied, indirect and direct, and appear to be appropriate for the specific program outcomes. They reflect systemic and going assessment across the department and focuses on student learning. A chart is available that maps particular assessment techniques to individual program outcomes.

The focus of assessment appears to be outcome and technique driven (via schedule) and also based on areas that the faculty identify as needing more inquiry, indicating systemic and organic assessment practices. The focus on assessment techniques provides a cross-program assessment of student progress that allows for the identification of patterns that may exist for students throughout their shared curriculum and on particular outcomes/tasks. The drawback to this approach may be a lack of systemic inquiry into program-specific student performance and learning, unless specifically deemed needed (e.g., a choice to focus on the UAS in 2013-14).

There is 1 outcome listed for ATM and mapped to assessment techniques. While the broader description of assessment activities in the assessment plan and annual report suggest that varied assessment is occurring for students, it is not clearly reported for ATM students and needs further development.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/NX
 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? Were the results tied to goals for student 	YES	NO <u>X</u>	QUALIFIED Y/N
learning?	YES	NO_X_	QUALIFIED Y/N

Comments:

It is clear that the department is engaged in relevant and specific ongoing assessment. As mentioned previously, there is a "Techniques schedule" for assessment tasks in addition to ongoing departmental assessment activities (i.e., Course Annual Reports), but it is unclear based on the assessment plan and results if individual programs are assessed regularly or only as needed.

It appears that each of these tasks/courses are required for most, if not all, majors, but because the majority of the results are reported in aggregate, how students from specific programs performed is not identified (apart from Task #3). Therefore, the results reported likely apply to Aviation Technology Management students and the information in the plan ties them back to the outcomes, but this is not as clearly addressed in the discussion of the results. Given the lack of information about ATM outcomes, the relationship to learning and areas of improvement specific to the program is not clear.

any goals for which the program presents findings, and, for X 1 Communication – written or oral ("able to wri Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "	ite and speak in	various sett	ings with a sense of purpose/audienc							
 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or "be intellectually curious"; analyze, synthesize, evaluate) Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or "be intellectually creative"; explore, discover, engage) Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning ("apply empirical dataanalyze graphical information") Information literacy ("be able to access and evaluatefor 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 f	for their commu	inities and fo	or the world")							
Comments regarding results and the application of results	s to program, in	ıstitutional,	and Essential Studies goals:							
The annual report indicates that an assessment of student we results for ATM students were not reported.	writing for all m	ajors was c	onducted during this review period, b							
4. CLOSING THE LOOP										
Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/NX							
• If so, do curricular or other improvements/										
changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	YES	NO	QUALIFIED Y/N _X_							
nature of the assessment, changes likely affect ATM student	ts but this is un	clear.								
SUMMARY	is, our mis is un									
SUMMARY Strengths	,		s for Improvement							
Strengths		Areas								
Strengths X A specific plan for assessment is in place.	No sp	Areas	For assessment is in place.							
Strengths X A specific plan for assessment is in place. Student learning goals are well-articulated.	No spo X Stud	Areas ecific plan f lent learning	For assessment is in place. g goals are not well-articulated.							
Strengths X A specific plan for assessment is in place.	No sp X Stud X Asse	Arease ecific plan for the learning essment met	For assessment is in place.							
Strengths X A specific plan for assessment is in place. Student learning goals are well-articulated. Assessment methods are clearly described.	No sp X Stud X Asse Asses:	Arease ecific plan for the dearning essment methods	For assessment is in place. g goals are not well-articulated. thods are not clearly described.							
Strengths 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.	No sp X Stud X Asses Assess A sing	Arease ecific plan for the learning essment methods ment methods ment method le type of a	For assessment is in place. g goals are not well-articulated. thods are not clearly described. ods are not appropriately selected. ods are not well-implemented. assessment methods predominates.							
Strengths 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.	No spo X Stud X Assess Assess A sing No res	Arease ecific plan for the learning essment method sment method le type of a sults are rep	For assessment is in place. g goals are not well-articulated. thods are not clearly described. ods are not appropriately selected. ods are not well-implemented. issessment methods predominates. orted.							
Strengths 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.	No spo X Stud Assess Assess A sing No res Result	Areas ecific plan f lent learning essment methors sment methors gle type of a sults are rep ts are not cle	For assessment is in place. g goals are not well-articulated. thods are not clearly described. ods are not appropriately selected. ods are not well-implemented. assessment methods predominates. orted. early tied to closing the loop.							
Strengths 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.	No spo X Stud Assess Assess A sing No res Result	Areas ecific plan f lent learning essment methors sment methors gle type of a sults are rep ts are not cle	For assessment is in place. g goals are not well-articulated. thods are not clearly described. ods are not appropriately selected. ods are not well-implemented. issessment methods predominates. orted.							
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.) OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDAT	No spondard	Areas ecific plan f lent learning essment methor sment methor gle type of a sults are rep ts are not close sion-making	For assessment is in place. g goals are not well-articulated. thods are not clearly described. ods are not appropriately selected. ods are not well-implemented. assessment methods predominates. corted. early tied to closing the loop. g is not directly tied to evidence.)							
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.) OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDAT. From the materials provided, it is evident that systemic assessinto student performance and learning. Because the assessment	No sponsorNo sponsorAssessorAssessorAsingNo resortResult. (Decisor. TONS: essment is in planent reviews are	Areas ecific plan f lent learning essment metho sment metho gle type of a sults are rep ts are not clo sion-making ace througho e conducted	For assessment is in place. g goals are not well-articulated. thods are not clearly described. ods are not appropriately selected. ods are not well-implemented. assessment methods predominates. forted. early tied to closing the loop. g is not directly tied to evidence.) out the department and allows for inq at the program-level the aggregated							
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.) OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDAT. From the materials provided, it is evident that systemic assessint student performance and learning. Because the assessment results are difficult to interpret for individual provided in the provided of the	No sponsorNo sponsorAssessorAssessorAssessorNo resortResult. (Decisor. TONS: essment is in planent reviews are regrams (e.g., A.)	Areas ecific plan f lent learning essment methor sment methor gle type of a sults are rep ts are not clo sion-making ace through e conducted TC, Commo	For assessment is in place. g goals are not well-articulated. thods are not clearly described. ods are not appropriately selected. ods are not well-implemented. assessment methods predominates. are rectally tied to closing the loop. g is not directly tied to evidence.) out the department and allows for inq at the program-level the aggregated ercial, Flight Education, etc. vs. all							
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.) OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDAT. From the materials provided, it is evident that systemic assessint student performance and learning. Because the assessment results are difficult to interpret for individual proposition majors). You may want to consider if there is relevance.	No sponsorNo sponsorAssessorAssessorAssessorNo resortResult. (Decisor. IONS: essment is in planent reviews are reograms (e.g., Assessor.) evance to disagg.	Areas ecific plan f lent learning essment method sment method gle type of a sults are rep ts are not cle sion-making ace throughe e conducted TC, Comme regating the	For assessment is in place. g goals are not well-articulated. thods are not clearly described. ods are not appropriately selected. ods are not well-implemented. assessment methods predominates. oorted. early tied to closing the loop. g is not directly tied to evidence.) out the department and allows for inq at the program-level the aggregated ercial, Flight Education, etc. vs. all e data at the program level. Is there							
Strengths 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.) OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDAT. From the materials provided, it is evident that systemic assessint o student performance and learning. Because the assessment results are difficult to interpret for individual providual program analysis that might be useful? For examples of the student performance and provided in the systemic assessment results are difficult to interpret for individual program analysis that might be useful? For examples of the systemic assessment results are difficult to interpret for individual program analysis that might be useful? For examples of the systemic assessment results are difficult to interpret for individual program analysis that might be useful? For examples of the systemic assessment results are difficult to interpret for individual program analysis that might be useful? For examples of the systemic assessment results are difficult to interpret for individual program analysis that might be useful?	No sponsorNo sponsorAssessorAssessorAssessorNo resortResult. (Decisor. IONS: essment is in planent reviews are reograms (e.g., Assessor.) evance to disagg.	Areas ecific plan f lent learning essment method sment method gle type of a sults are rep ts are not cle sion-making ace throughe e conducted TC, Comme regating the	For assessment is in place. g goals are not well-articulated. thods are not clearly described. ods are not appropriately selected. ods are not well-implemented. assessment methods predominates. oorted. early tied to closing the loop. g is not directly tied to evidence.) out the department and allows for inq at the program-level the aggregated ercial, Flight Education, etc. vs. all e data at the program level. Is there							
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.) OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDAT. From the materials provided, it is evident that systemic assessint o student performance and learning. Because the assessment results are difficult to interpret for individual proparam analysis that might be useful? For examstudents stage task performance?	No spendsNo spendsNo spendsNo respendsNo respendsNo respendsNo respendsNo spendsNo spends	Areas ecific plan f lent learning essment method sment method gle type of a sults are rep ts are not cle sion-making ace throughe e conducted TC, Commo regating the useful to lo	For assessment is in place. g goals are not well-articulated. thods are not clearly described. ods are not appropriately selected. ods are not well-implemented. assessment methods predominates. orted. early tied to closing the loop. g is not directly tied to evidence.) out the department and allows for inquat the program-level the aggregated ercial, Flight Education, etc. vs. alled the data at the program level. Is there took at program-specific (e.g., ATC)							
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.) OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDAT. From the materials provided, it is evident that systemic assessinto student performance and learning. Because the assessment	No spendsNo spendsNo spendsNo respendsNo respendsNo respendsNo respendsNo spendsNo spends	Areas ecific plan f lent learning essment method sment method gle type of a sults are rep ts are not cle sion-making ace throughe e conducted TC, Commo regating the useful to lo	For assessment is in place. g goals are not well-articulated. thods are not clearly described. ods are not appropriately selected. ods are not well-implemented. assessment methods predominates. orted. early tied to closing the loop. g is not directly tied to evidence.) out the department and allows for inquat the program-level the aggregated ercial, Flight Education, etc. vs. alled the data at the program level. Is there took at program-specific (e.g., ATC)							
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.) OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDAT. From the materials provided, it is evident that systemic asses into student performance and learning. Because the assessment results are difficult to interpret for individual proparation majors). You may want to consider if there is releindividual program analysis that might be useful? For examstudents stage task performance? Specific to the ATM program, more learning outcomes nee	No spondary Stude No spondary Stude Assessed Assessed Asing No resequence for the control of the control	Areas ecific plan f lent learning essment method sment method gle type of a sults are rep ts are not cle sion-making ace throughe e conducted TC, Commo regating the useful to lo	For assessment is in place. g goals are not well-articulated. thods are not clearly described. ods are not appropriately selected. ods are not well-implemented. assessment methods predominates. orted. early tied to closing the loop. g is not directly tied to evidence.) out the department and allows for inquat the program-level the aggregated ercial, Flight Education, etc. vs. alled the data at the program level. Is there took at program-specific (e.g., ATC)							
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.) OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDAT. From the materials provided, it is evident that systemic assessinto student performance and learning. Because the assessinassessment results are difficult to interpret for individual proparticular analysis that might be useful? For examistudents stage task performance? Specific to the ATM program, more learning outcomes nee	No spondary Stude No spondary Stude Assessed Assessed Asing No resequence for the control of the control	Areas ecific plan f lent learning essment method sment method gle type of a sults are rep ts are not cle sion-making ace throughe e conducted TC, Commo regating the useful to lo	For assessment is in place. g goals are not well-articulated. thods are not clearly described. ods are not appropriately selected. ods are not well-implemented. assessment methods predominates. orted. early tied to closing the loop. g is not directly tied to evidence.) out the department and allows for inquat the program-level the aggregated ercial, Flight Education, etc. vs. alled the data at the program level. Is there took at program-specific (e.g., ATC)							

	s assessment review blease describe)		
Reviewer(s):	Department Tea Phone Number 7-4	sey Ozaki aching & Learning 256 olyn.ozaki@und.edu	Deborah Worley Educational Leadership 7-3140 deborah.worley@und.edu
Section 1: Q	Section 2: Q Section 3:	O Section 4: O	
		` _	aind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing all kinds of data to be collected and analyzed in other
Q	= qualified yes as action or prog	ress is apparent; howe	ver, evidence is lacking that this is completely and

appropriately done
= no, it is unclear whether it was done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning

Revised Sept 24, 2014

N