

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Feedback to Non-Academic Units on Assessment Activities Reported in 2006-2007 Annual Reports

DEPARTMENT Memorial Union **DATE** 080314

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Jon Jackson, Nabil Suleiman

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- Were any goals referenced? YES NO QUALIFIED Y/N
- If so, were goals well articulated? YES NO QUALIFIED Y/N
- Do goals address student learning? YES NO QUALIFIED Y/N

Comments:

Undergraduate/Graduate (not differentiated):

Goals were designed to line up EXACTLY with Institutional and Gen Ed goals — what is NOT clear is the nature and number of targeted students outside of the Greek, Student Activities Committee leadership, Adult Re-entry program, etc., and how, if at all, the average student is targeted /assessed for these goals by the Union programming.

In addition to the Departmental goals, please also consider UND’s Institutional and General Education goals for student learning (shown in alignment within parentheses). Use ‘U’ (undergraduate) or ‘G’ (graduate) to identify UND/General Education goals which are similar to the referenced departmental goals.

- 1 Communication (“communicate effectively, both orally and in writing”)
- 2 Critical/creative thinking (“think critically and creatively” and “be intellectually curious and creative”)
- 3 Informed choices (“make informed choices”)
- 4 Understanding across disciplines (“understand how conclusions are reached in the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the arts and sciences” and “acquire knowledge over a broad spectrum of subject areas”)
- 5 Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)
- 6 Cross-cultural appreciation (“develop some familiarity with cultures other than their own”)
- 7 Service/citizenship (“commit themselves to...the service of others,” and “share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)

Comments regarding Departmental goals and alignment of Departmental Goals with Institutional and General Education Goals:

Undergraduate:

Great job adapting the institutional plans – the targeted student audience seems to be (from the Annual Report) limited to the leadership of Greek organizations, student groups, and members of the student work force at the union.

Graduate:

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

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

Comments:

See notes about affected student populations above. Referenced tools were mostly surveys and interviews.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• Were the results tied to goals for student learning?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

A lot of activity conducted to determine the effectiveness of certain leadership activities in the Union. Lots of focus on Greek community, leadership of student organizations, but little in terms of any other activities hosted by, or programmed by the union and its staff.

In addition to departmental goals, some assessment results may be applicable to Institutional and General Education goals. A list of the latter goals is included below. Use ‘U’ (undergraduate) or ‘G’ (graduate) to identify those results which are applicable to Institutional/General Education goal achievement. For these items, please describe findings in the appropriate section below.

- 1 Communication (“communicate effectively, both orally and in writing”)
- 2 Critical/creative thinking (“think critically and creatively” and “be intellectually curious and creative”)
- 3 Informed choices (“make informed choices”)
- 4 Understanding across disciplines (“understand how conclusions are reached in the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the arts and sciences” and “acquire knowledge over a broad spectrum of subject areas”)
- 5 Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)
- 6 Cross-cultural appreciation (“develop some familiarity with cultures other than their own”)
- 7 Service/citizenship (“commit themselves to...the service of others,” and “share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)

Comments regarding results and the application of results to Departmental, Institutional and General Education Goals: There is a wealth of information (not all shared as part of the annual report) that gets at the question of the impact that Memorial Union programming has on students. It seems geared toward a very small subset of the overall student population, however, and there is no mention of how these results translate into the larger campus community.

Undergraduate/Graduate:

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
• If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

Given the small targeted population of student leaders/student employees described in this annual report, the descriptions and plans for how programs will change based on the reported assessment results is very well done, and represents thoughtful and thorough attention to meaningful closing of the loop.

Undergraduate/Graduate:

SUMMARY

Strengths

Areas for Improvement

- A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- Student learning goals are well-articulated.
- Assessment methods are clearly described.
- Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
- Assessment methods are well-implemented.
- Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
- Results are reported.
- Results are tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

- No specific plan for assessment is in place.
- Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
- Assessment methods are not clearly described.
- Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
- Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
- A single type of assessment methods predominates.
- No results are reported.
- Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

This is a good program. The only concern raised by a review of the annual report is that the results are tied to very small and focused groups of students, representative of a small percentage of the total student use of the Memorial Union facility and its services.

Reviewer(s):	Name	Jon Jackson	Nabil Suleiman
	Department	Anatomy & Cell Biology	Engineering
	Phone Number	7-4911	7-3997
	e-mail	jackson@mdicine.nodak.edu	nabil.suleiman@mail.und.nodak.edu

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

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well
- N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA = no information available
- ? = action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done