

**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE**  
**Feedback to Non-Academic Units on Assessment Activities Reported in 2011-12 Annual Reports**  
**NON-ACADEMIC PROGRAMS**

**DEPARTMENT** McNair **DATE** 11-16-12

**PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW** McNair Program (TRIO)

**COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW** Mary K. Askim-Lovseth & Deborah Worley

**1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS**

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

**Comments:**

*The Assessment Plan posted (January 2007) indicates that the “McNair Program does not specifically assess individual student performance.” Four objectives are identified in the Annual Report; all relate to program outcomes (i.e., percent participation in completing research and scholarly activities, attain a baccalaureate degree, enrollment in a post-baccalaureate program, and attain a doctoral degree).*

In addition to Program goals, please also consider UND’s Institutional and Essential Studies goals for student learning (shown in alignment within parentheses). Identify UND/Essential Studies goals which are similar to the referenced program goals.

- 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 departmental goals and alignment of program goals with institutional and Essential Studies goals:**

**2. ASSESSMENT METHODS**

- Were any specific assessment methods referenced? YES X NO      QUALIFIED Y/N
- If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? YES      NO 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:**

*The Assessment Plan notes only assessment measures for the program. These include “...grade point average, graduation, application to graduate school, attendance at program events, low-income and first-generation college status, progress toward doctoral degree, completion of doctoral degree, and other areas...”*

*Self-reporting data were obtained on percentage accepted into a graduate program and the number who have worked with a faculty member in completing research. Acquisition of knowledge was monitored by midterm grade reports and semester GPAs (both not student learning assessment measures).*

**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 type="checkbox"/>	NO <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
• Were the results tied to goals for student learning?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>

**Comments:**

*Data were provided on the percentage (60) accepted into a graduate program and that all students' progress was tracked in their programs. It was also reported that 90 percent of the McNair participants had completed scholarly activities with faculty mentors.*

In addition to program goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. Please identify those results which are applicable to institutional/Essential Studies goal achievement. For indicated items, please 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 programmatic, institutional and Essential Studies goals:**

**4. CLOSING THE LOOP**

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>

**Comments:**

*No closing the loop activities were reported regarding the program.*

**SUMMARY**

<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Areas for Improvement</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> A specific plan for assessment is in place.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No specific plan for assessment is in place.
<input type="checkbox"/> Student learning goals are well-articulated.	<input type="checkbox"/> Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment methods are clearly described.	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment methods are not clearly described.
<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment methods are appropriately selected.	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment methods are well-implemented.	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
<input type="checkbox"/> Direct and indirect methods are implemented.	<input type="checkbox"/> A single type of assessment methods predominates.
<input type="checkbox"/> Results are reported.	<input type="checkbox"/> No results are reported.
<input type="checkbox"/> Results are tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is tied to evidence.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop. (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

**OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:**

*As noted in the Assessment Plan, the McNair Program does not address the assessment of individual student learning. Rather, it focuses on the degree of student participation in different aspects of the Program and the success of students at each level.*

*It seems that the core of the Program is to promote lifelong learning for underrepresented populations, which could be stated as a student learning goal and tracked by student as s/he progresses each year through the McNair Program. There might also be an opportunity to craft student learning goals and appropriate means of assessment (direct and indirect) that correspond to the program goals and priorities that are mentioned in the Annual Report. For example, student self-assessment of knowledge gained at monthly seminars would be an indirect measure that could be used to assess a student learning goal related to information literacy.*

**MATERIALS REVIEWED**

- Annual report
- Appendices (cited in annual report)
- Other (please describe)
- Assessment plan (as posted)
- Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	<i>Mary K. Askim-Lovseth</i>	<i>Deborah Worley</i>
	Department	<i>Marketing</i>	<i>Educational Leadership</i>
	Phone Number	<i>777-2930</i>	<i>777-3140</i>
	e-mail	<a href="mailto:maskim@business.und.edu"><i>maskim@business.und.edu</i></a>	<a href="mailto:deborah.worley@und.edu"><i>deborah.worley@und.edu</i></a>

-----  
Section 1:   N      Section 2:   N      Section 3:   N      Section 4:   N  

**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)
- 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

*Revised 10/11/12*