

**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**  
**Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2013-14**

**UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

**DEPARTMENT** Technology **DATE** April 28, 2015

**PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW** BS in Industrial Technology (BSIT) & BS in Graphic Design Technology (BSGDT)

**COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW** Devon Hansen and Bradley Myers

**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 Department of Technology does not have separate assessment plans for the BS in Industrial Technology (BSIT) and the BS in Graphic Design Technology (BSGDT) programs. The current undergraduate assessment plan for Technology was last updated in October 2012. As part of this plan, the department lists six goals for student learning. A new template was pilot tested and evaluated in Spring 2013; however the program goals were not updated until the Spring 2014. Consequently, for this assessment review the new template was used to collect data on the old student learning goals.

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”)  
      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:***

The six student learning goals are directly related to three Essential Studies goals (Communication, thinking and reasoning – critical thinking, and thinking and reasoning – creative thinking).

**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:***

The assessment report identifies direct methods grouped in four categories (assignments, projects, presentations, and exams). The indirect methods identified are grouped in four categories (one-to-one individual interviews with students, minute papers, focus groups, and surveys). The average numbers of goals (three with two courses assessing five goals) assessed by eight courses were presented in a table, but we do not know which courses or methods are assessing which goals.

### 3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES____	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N _X____
• 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____	NO_X____	QUALIFIED Y/N ____

#### ***Comments:***

The assessment report presents some results in a table with eight courses listed by number of students and level only (not individual course number), and by percentage of students meeting program goals. Courses are scored (does not meet, progressing, fulfill, or exceed) on meeting student learning goals. We do not know which courses are assessing which goals. The summary concludes “students in smaller classes tend to do better than students in larger classes” and “students in 100 and 200 level classes where knowledge, comprehension, skill or competence based are fulfilling or exceeding the program goals.” No specific evidence is provided to affirm achievement of goals or whether the results are tied to goals for student learning.

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.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 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:***

### 4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?	YES____	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N _X____
• If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	YES____	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N _X____

#### ***Comments:***

Overall, the stated closing the loop activities seem to be related more to improving the process in order to better assess the student learning goals. The assessment report also questioned whether goal number 4: Develop an appreciation for ethical and professional practice should be listed as a student learning goal since no class collected assessment data relevant to the goal.

### SUMMARY

#### ***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.)

#### ***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 department's assessment activities are clearly in a period of transition. The assessment report does not differentiate between the BS in Industrial Technology (BSIT) and the BS in Graphic Design Technology (BSGDT) programs when reporting assessment activities. There needs to be separate assessment plans for each of these programs. Although the assessment report has six stated goals for student learning, there is a lack of evidence whether those goals are being achieved. We recommend that the Department of Technology reach out to Mary Askim-Lovseth or Joan Hawthorne for consultation to improve the department's assessment activities.

## MATERIALS REVIEWED

☒ Annual assessment report  
☐ Annual Report  
☒ Assessment plan (as posted)  
☒ Previous assessment review  
☐ Other (please describe)

Reviewer(s):	Name	Devon Hansen	Bradley Myers	_____
	Department	Geography	Law School	_____
	Phone Number	7-4587	7-2228	_____
	e-mail	<a href="mailto:devon.hansen@und.edu">devon.hansen@und.edu</a>	<a href="mailto:myers@law.und.edu">myers@law.und.edu</a>	_____

Section 1: ☐ Y \_\_\_\_\_ Section 2: ☐ Q \_\_\_\_\_ 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

*Revised Sept 24, 2014*

**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**  
**Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2013-14**

**GRADUATE PROGRAMS**

**DEPARTMENT** Technology **DATE** April 28, 2015

**PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW** M.S. in Technology

**COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW** Devon Hansen and Bradley Myers

**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 student learning goals were not stated in the assessment report except to say that program goals 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 were assessed in four courses. In the graduate program assessment plan (2012-2013), however there were only four stated goals for student learning. It seems that the assessment plan combines goals two and three into a single goal.

**2. ASSESSMENT METHODS**

- |  |              |                |                           |
|--|--------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced?   | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals?        | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |

***Comments:***

Tables are presented that indicate how the program goals are aligned with assessment methods used in individual courses, and how the programs goals are aligned with assessment methods used with theses and independent studies. The department utilizes indirect assessment methods, such as one-to-one interviews with students about courses and the program.

**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>X</u>    | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |
| • If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?            | YES <u>    </u> | NO <u>X</u>    | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>    </u> |
| • Were the results tied to goals for student learning?   | YES <u>    </u> | NO <u>    </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u>    |

***Comments:***

The assessment report presents some results in a table with four courses listed by class 1, class 2, class 3, class 4 (not individual course number) and by percentage of students meeting program goals. Courses and comprehensive examinations are scored (does not meet, progressing, fulfill, or exceed) on meeting student learning goals. The summary concludes that because of the small class size ‘it is very likely that more students will not only pass the class but achieve grades in the ‘fulfill’ or ‘exceed’ category.” No specific evidence is provided to affirm achievement of goals or to indicate need for improvement.

The summary of the indirect assessment method (one-to-one interviews) states “students were not uniformly exhibiting critically thinking. Some students were creative but not necessarily critically evaluating their creative ideas.”

#### 4. CLOSING THE LOOP

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

YES X \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N \_\_\_\_\_

- If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?

YES X \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_ QUALIFIED Y/N \_\_\_\_\_

#### *Comments:*

Closing the loop activities propose that the Readings and Methodology courses (Tech 590 and 591) be taught as seminars rather than independent study courses so students “can benefit more from the discussions and critique of each other’s writing.”

#### SUMMARY

##### *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.)

##### *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 department’s assessment activities are clearly in a period of transition. Although the department has stated goals for student learning, there is a lack of evidence whether those goals are being achieved.

#### MATERIALS REVIEWED

- X \_\_\_\_\_ Annual assessment report
- \_\_\_\_\_ Annual report
- X \_\_\_\_\_ Assessment plan (as posted)
- X \_\_\_\_\_ Previous assessment review
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other (please describe)

Reviewer(s):	Name	Devon Hansen	Bradley Myers	_____
	Department	Geography	Law School	_____
	Phone Number	7-4587	7-2228	_____
	e-mail	<a href="mailto:devon.hansen@und.edu">devon.hansen@und.edu</a>	<a href="mailto:myers@law.und.edu">myers@law.und.edu</a>	_____

Section 1: Y \_\_\_\_\_ Section 2: Y \_\_\_\_\_ Section 3: Q \_\_\_\_\_ Section 4: Y \_\_\_\_\_

#### 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