

2003 ACT Alumni Outcomes Survey
Questions and *(Preliminary) Answers*

1. The data collected addresses information relating to what university group or situation?

Primarily Administration:

C Kupchella, President

J Ettling, VP Academic Affairs & Provost, 2003; Martha Potvin, Interim, 2004

R Boyd, VP Student & Outreach Services

A Hoffert, Assoc VP for Enrollment Management

K Ruit, Assistant Provost

N Krogh, Registrar

D Vorland, Director of University Relations

M Thompson, Director of Career Services

Assessment Committee

2. How often is this tool used and analyzed? What time of year?

The 2003 ACT Alumni Outcomes Survey was mailed in January 2003 to alumni graduating between December 1999 through August 2000. For this first time use, 2119 surveys were sent; 557 were returned, for a 26 percent return rate. The cost of the survey was \$3500, or \$6.70 per respondent.

The 2004 ACT Alumni Outcomes Survey was mailed in February 2004 to alumni graduating between December 2000 and August 2001. Two thousand fifty-five (2055) surveys were sent; 1952 were delivered; 367 were analyzed; the overall net response rate was 19%. The cost of the survey was \$3595.35, or \$9.80 per respondent.

3. To whom does the assessment group believe that an analysis of this report would be beneficial? In other words, what individuals, departments, or programs need this information in order to have reliable information to 'close the loop' on their assessment process?

While a review of the report could be of interest to academic departments, little could be gleaned relative to the assessment of student learning.

4. Who is responsible to provide the assessment group the information for this report?

The Office of Institutional Research. Carmen Williams, Director and Jean Chen, Research Analyst

5. What UND student learning goals are being assessed?

Nothing specific to UND's mission or student learning goals; some "Educational Outcomes" (see Section III of the survey instrument) go toward UND goals, but the information sought as to them is not useful for assessment of student learning because it does not ask the responder to indicate how UND contributed to her or his growth on that goal.

6. What evidence is provided or should be provided to support the group's findings?

This question cannot be answered without knowing what the conclusion is that might, or might not, need to be supported.

7. What evidence does the assessment group believe should be collected/compiled for the focused visit or the next accreditation visit?

Whatever pertains to the specific comments in the HLC reports about deficiencies in assessment of student learning at UND, plus information generally required on assessment programs under the HLC criteria for accreditation.

8. Is this tool a direct measure, an indirect measure, or a non-measure of student learning?

The tool is an indirect measure at best, and more probably a non-measure of student learning. The purpose of the ACT Alumni Survey was to measure the value that graduates place on their educational experiences while [here], as well as their success after graduation.

9. Does this tool empower individuals or the university to better understand and assess student learning at the university? If so, how?

No, see #8 above.

10. Is there a better way to obtain or report the data to be analyzed?

The data obtained and the reporting of those data is interesting. However, see 8 and 9, above.

11. At what level of assessment is the tool being used; beginning level, making progress level, or maturing stage of continuous improvement? Is there any evidence to support the assessment group's deduction?

Unknown level.

12. Does the tool reflect a culture of assessment at UND?

While use of this tool does evidence the University's interest in outcomes, it does not address student learning and could not be used to close any loop.

13. Does the tool need increased university or administrative support or faculty involvement in order to make it more useable or effective?

The survey, which has only been administered once and only to alumni graduating from December 1999 through August 2000, did not take advantage of the option to add up to 30 local questions. If this instrument is to have any future utility in the assessment of student learning, local questions should be drafted that might provide information useful to that task. In addition, UND as a user should press ACT to revise or expand Section III of the instrument "Educational Outcomes," to get responses which would enable us to better understand the respondent's view of the level of the University's contribution to responder growth. The local questions must be drafted to reach learning goal elements of the mission statement and other specific learning objectives identified by the University (for instance, in the general education requirement).

14. Does the assessment group need any administrative insight or guidance in order to analyze the tool effectively?

No. The report is clearly and well presented. The group will provide its analysis, and, if the group's analysis becomes the committee's analysis, administration can use that as best it can in the improvement of the University.

15. What value does the group place on this tool for helping to achieve the university's assessment plan?"

The tool is not designed to assist in direct or indirect assessment of student learning. The report analyzing the survey responses describes the purpose of the survey as "... to measure the value that graduates place on their educational experience while ... [here]." That is not a purpose that can directly assist in assessment of student learning.

16. What are the findings of the assessment of this assessment tool?

See 15, above.