

UCF Assessment

Assessment Plan and Results

Plan Year: Status: Plan Approved for DRC Report
 Program/Unit: Last Updated: 12/18/2012 4:53:03 PM

IE Assessment Rubrics
 Assessment DRC Chair Instructions
 Assessment for Unit Heads

[View/Submit Plan Review](#) [2011-2012 Plan Review](#)

Program/Unit:	Communication - M.A.	DRC:	College of Sciences
Year:	2012-2013	DRC Chair:	Cynthia Y Young
Due Date:	05/01/2013	Coordinator (s):	Harry Weger , Boyd Lindsley, Kim Tuorto
		Reviewer(s):	Seth Elsheimer

Quick Links:

Mission:

The Communication M.A. Program is dedicated to serving its students, faculty, the Central Florida community and the professions associated with the field of communication. The mission of the program is to offer high-quality, academically challenging graduate education in Mass and Interpersonal Communication; to mentor students in the conduct of research and creative activities; to provide the program's students with the educational development that will enhance the intellectual, cultural, environmental, and economic development of the metropolitan region; to develop students' academic and professional competencies; to establish UCF as a major presence in local and global communication related professional and academic communities; and to, thereby, support the mission and vision of the University of Central Florida as a whole.

Assessment Process:

The assessment process is designed to measure student competencies using direct and indirect assessments of student learning of academic, research, and professional skills. The plan includes direct measures of student competencies in the areas of theory, methodology, preparedness for doctoral work, critical thinking, and communication skills. Students' competencies are measured by evaluating specific sections of their theses (completed in the immediately previous fall, spring, and summer semesters) or by evaluating responses to specific comprehensive exam questions (completed in the immediate fall, spring, and summer semesters) addressing quantitative research methods, qualitative research methods, or communication theory; through surveys administered online; and through supervisors' assessments of students' workplace communication skills. Theses and comprehensive exam responses are evaluated by a panel of faculty members using a rubric. Reviews of exam responses occur in the first two weeks of the fall semester. Reviews of theses occur at the

time of the thesis defense. Indirect measures of preparedness for doctoral work and relevance of the program to professional career settings are measured using an online survey of recently graduated students administered in late August or early September.

Mission Statement and Process Comments:

This seems reasonable and appropriate.

Please consider the following:

- Concise
- Lists stakeholders
- States purpose
- States primary functions, learning outcomes, and/or operations
- Supports the institution's mission
- Uniquely related to the Academic Program/Administrative Unit

☐ Revision or explanation needed

☒ Satisfactory

Top

Outcome: 1

At least 90% of students will demonstrate satisfactory or above satisfactory knowledge of the literature in their field.

Measure: 1.1

Above Satisfactory = Students taking comprehensive examinations will pass all of the elective portion of the exam (3/3 questions). Satisfactory = Students taking comprehensive examinations will pass at least 2 out of three questions on the elective portion of the exam. Below satisfactory = students fail 2/3 questions on the elective portion of the exam.

Measure: 1.2

A panel of three faculty will judge the literature reviews in the past year's theses as above satisfactory, satisfactory or unsatisfactory in terms of (1) breadth, and (2) depth of knowledge demonstrated. Rubric: 3 = Above Satisfactory: both breadth and depth of literature review is at peer reviewed journal quality; 2 = Satisfactory: breadth or depth, but not both, at peer reviewed journal quality; 1 = Below Satisfactory: neither breadth nor depth at peer reviewed journal quality.

Outcome & Measures Review:

☐ Revision or explanation needed

☒ Satisfactory

Outcome & Measures Comment:

This seems reasonable.

Attachments:

Top

Outcome: 2

At least 90% of students will demonstrate satisfactory or above satisfactory knowledge of quantitative research methods.

Measure: 2.1

A panel of three faculty will judge a random sample of 15 of the past year's comprehensive exams in quantitative research methods as 3 = above satisfactory, 2 = satisfactory or 1 = unsatisfactory in terms of (1) understanding of validity issues in research design, and (2) ability to plan appropriate data analyses. [Please see attachment describing the rationale for sampling and an explanation of the randomization procedure.](#)

Measure: 2.2

A panel of three faculty will judge the methodology and results chapters in the past year's theses that use a quantitative research methodology as 3 = above satisfactory, 2 = satisfactory or 1 = unsatisfactory in terms of (1) understanding of validity issues in research design, and (2) ability to plan appropriate data analyses.

Outcome & Measures Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Outcome & Measures Comment:

Okay

Attachments: Rationale for Sampling Proposal and Explanation of Randomization Procedure.docx

Top

Outcome: 3

At least 90% of students will demonstrate satisfactory or above satisfactory knowledge of qualitative research methods. (N= 15).

Measure: 3.1

A panel of three faculty will judge a random sample of 15 of the past year's comprehensive exams in qualitative research methods as 3 = above satisfactory, 2 = satisfactory or 1 = unsatisfactory in terms of (1) understanding of validity issues in research design, and (2) ability to plan appropriate data analyses. [Please see attachment describing the rationale for sampling and an explanation of the randomization procedure.](#)

Measure: 3.2

A panel of three faculty will judge the methodology and results chapters in the past year's theses that use a qualitative research methodology as 3 = above satisfactory, 2 = satisfactory or 1 = unsatisfactory in terms of (1) understanding of validity issues in research design, and (2) ability to plan appropriate data analyses.

Outcome & Measures Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Outcome & Measures Comment:

Seems fine.

Attachments:[Top](#)**Outcome: 4**

At least 90% of graduates who apply to doctoral programs will be satisfactorily or above satisfactorily prepared to succeed at the doctoral level.

Measure: 4.1

Our graduates who entered doctoral programs will be asked (email survey) how well their masters program prepared them for doctoral work (above satisfactory, satisfactory, below satisfactory) in the area of theory. Data will be collected for the past three years.

Measure: 4.2

Our graduates who entered doctoral programs will be asked (email survey) how well their masters program prepared them for doctoral work (above satisfactory, satisfactory, below satisfactory) in the area of methodology. Data will be collected for the past three years.

Measure: 4.3

Our graduates who entered doctoral programs will be asked (email survey) to identify specific areas in which the NSC M.A. program was weak in preparing them for doctoral level work.

Measure: 4.4

At least 80% of our graduates who apply to doctoral programs will have published one or more peer-reviewed articles and/or presented one or more conference papers as a student in our Program.

Measure: 4.5

To assess program weaknesses in preparing students for graduate work, graduates who go on to Ph.D. programs will be asked (email survey) to identify weaknesses in our program in preparing them for doctoral level work in our discipline.

Outcome & Measures Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Outcome & Measures Comment:

This all seems reasonable and appropriate.

Attachments:[Top](#)**Outcome: 5**

At least 80% of graduates will report favorably on the impact of the Program's relevance to professional career advancement. (N=approx. 25).

Measure: 5.1

Students will be contacted by email within one year of graduation and asked to assess the impact of the degree on their career advancement. An email reminder will be sent to those who do not respond within one week. Data will be presented for the previous year.

Measure: 5.2

Students will be contacted (email survey) within one year of graduation and asked to assess the relevance of program content to applied professional settings. Data will be presented for the previous year.

Measure: 5.3

Students will be contacted by email within one year of graduation and asked to identify specific areas of weakness in the M.A. program as it relates to their perceived preparation for their professional development.

Outcome & Measures Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Outcome & Measures Comment:

Seems okay

Attachments:

Top

Outcome: 6

At least 90% of graduates will demonstrate satisfactory critical/analytical thinking skills (N= 15). Rubric for outcome 6, measures (1) and (2): Above Satisfactory: Writing consistently demonstrates competency in at least three of the following characteristics: presents a clearly defined central position; provides the necessary amount of evidence to support claims; chooses the appropriate evidence to support claims; offers logical explanation of evidence: Satisfactory: writing generally demonstrates competency in at least three of the following: presents a clearly defined central position; provides the necessary amount of evidence to support claims; chooses the appropriate evidence to support claims; offers logical explanation of evidence: Below Satisfactory: Writing consistently fails to demonstrates competencies above and/or consistently demonstrates two or more of the following problems: lacks or does not clearly define a central position; fails to provide enough evidence to support claims; chooses inappropriate or irrelevant evidence to support claims; offers illogical or no explanation of evidence. **Please see attachment describing the rationale for sampling and an explanation of the randomization procedure.**

Measure: 6.1

Students taking comprehensive exams will be required to submit a writing sample consisting of any paper written for a course in the Communication M.A. program. A panel of three faculty will assess the student's writing using the the rubric above. 15 of the papers will be chosen at random for assessment purposes.

Measure: 6.2

A panel of three faculty will judge students' critical thinking skills based on the literature review and discussion sections of the past year's theses. The rating scale will be above satisfactory, satisfactory, below satisfactory using the rubric above.

Outcome & Measures Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Outcome & Measures Comment:

Fine

Attachments:

[Top](#)

Outcome: 7

Graduates will demonstrate satisfactory communication skills on the following measures:

Measure: 7.1

Students taking comprehensive exams will be required to submit a writing sample consisting of any paper written for a course in the Communication M.A. program. A panel of three faculty will assess the student's writing using the the rubric below. 15 student papers will be selected randomly for review. At least 90% of students will score Above satisfactory or Satisfactory.

Rubric for measure 7.1: Above Satisfactory: Writing shows high competence in the areas of precision, organization (including effective use of transitions), use of grammar, and language usage. Satisfactory: Writing is below the high competence level in one or more areas listed in the AS category, but is at least adequate in all areas. Unsatisfactory: Writing is below adequate and needs improvement in one or more areas listed in the AS category

Measure: 7.2

Students completing internships will be assessed on their workplace interpersonal communication skills by their supervisors. Upon completion of the internship, supervisors will be asked to complete an online questionnaire consisting of the Communicator Competence Questionnaire. As a group, internship students will reach **at least a score of 5.5** on a 7 point scale on the CCQ (**see attachment for items**) for a satisfactory assessment.

Outcome & Measures Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Outcome & Measures Comment:

Good

Attachments: CCQ.docx**Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Plan Rubric**

*If programs or units fail to provide any input, their plan will be evaluated with "No effort (0)."

- ☐ Beginning (1) ☐ Emerging (2) ☐ Meets Expectations (3) ☒ Accomplished (4) ☐ Exemplary (5)

Indicators:

- ☒ 1. Mission statement includes the following: name of program/unit, purpose, primary functions and activities, and stakeholders

☒ 2. Assessment process is provided and describes assessment strategies, and how the program or unit members are involved

☒ 3. Number of outcomes:

- administrative units: minimum of three outcomes
- graduate academic programs: minimum of three student learning outcomes
- undergraduate academic programs: minimum of eight student learning outcomes that incorporates academic learning compacts

☒ 4. Minimum of two appropriate measures for each outcome; at least one is a direct measure

☒ 5. Measures establish specific, quantifiable performance targets

☒ 6. Measures and targets are designed to promote improvement

Additional Indicators:

☒ 7. Specific assessment instruments are made available (e.g., via URL, as attachments, etc.), if not proprietary

☐ 8. Outcomes in the plan include stretch targets or include measurement of academic or operational initiatives that resulted from previous assessment

☐ 9. Describes the relationship between the Institutional Effectiveness Assessment plan and the University's Strategic Plan

Overall Comments on Outcomes and Measures:

This seems reasonable and appropriate.