

UCF Assessment

Assessment Plan and Results

Plan Year: Status: Results Approved
 for DRC Report
 Program/Unit: Last Updated: 9/28/2012 3:18:11 PM

IE Assessment Rubrics
 Assessment DRC Chair Instructions
 Assessment for Unit Heads

[View/Submit Results Review](#) [2010-2011 Results Review](#)

Program/Unit:	Communication - M.A.	DRC:	College of Sciences
Year:	2011-2012	DRC Chair:	Cynthia Y Young
Due Date:		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.

Top

Outcome: 1

At least 90% of students will demonstrate satisfactory or above satisfactory knowledge of the literature in their field. (N= approx. 25)

Measure: 1.1

A panel of three faculty will judge the past year's comprehensive exams in mass communication theory and modern communication theory as above satisfactory, satisfactory or unsatisfactory in terms of (1) breadth, and (2) depth of knowledge demonstrated. Rubric: 3 = Above Satisfactory: demonstrates precise and detailed understanding of theoretical bases of one or more communication theories; 2 = Satisfactory: demonstrates basic understanding of one or more communication theories, but lacks precision and/or detail; 1 = Below Satisfactory: fails to demonstrate basic understanding of one or more communication theories

Result:

N = 27

Above Satisfactory = 39% (n = 10)

Satisfactory = 42% (n = 14)

Below Satisfactory = 19% (n = 3)

88% of students demonstrated satisfactory knowledge of the field on this measure.
Goal Not Met.

Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
 Satisfactory

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.

Result:

N = 4

Above Satisfactory = 2

Satisfactory = 2

Below Satisfactory = 0

100% of theses students demonstrated satisfactory knowledge of the literature in the field

on this measure.

Goal Met.

Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
 Satisfactory

Reflective Statement:

89.6% of students overall demonstrated at least satisfactory knowledge of the literature in the field.

Goal not met.

This year appears to be a slight aberration from typical year's results. At this point, we do not see any need to make adjustments to courses, schedules, or offerings. We will monitor students' progress closely next year and if the trend continues, we will try to take a closer look at what specific problems students are having in this area and what ways we can reverse this trend.

Reflective Statement Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
 Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Good! The program had an ambitious but reasonable goal and came quite close to achieving it. Data were collected and used to evaluate the program and the goals.

Attachments:

[Top](#)

Outcome: 2

At least 90% of students will demonstrate satisfactory or above satisfactory knowledge of quantitative research methods. (N=approx. 25).

Measure: 2.1

A panel of three faculty will judge 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.

Result:

N = 32

Above satisfactory = 25% (n = 8)

Satisfactory = 50% (n = 16)

Below Satisfactory = 25% (n = 8)

75% of students taking comprehensive exams demonstrated satisfactory knowledge of quantitative research methods.

Goal not met on this measure.

Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
 Satisfactory

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.

Result:

N = 2

Above Satisfactory = 0

Satisfactory = 2

Below Satisfactory = 0

100% of students writing a theses using quantitative methodology demonstrated satisfactory knowledge of quantitative research methodology.

Goal Met on this measure.

Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
 Satisfactory

Reflective Statement:

77% of students overall demonstrated satisfactory knowledge of quantitative research methodology.

Goal not met.

It is instructive to point out that 100% of our thesis students are meeting this goal. This is understandable since three faculty members review the students' methods before the final evaluation. We therefore think it is important to look more closely at students' performance on the comprehensive examinations.

Although the comprehensive examination results are still below our goal of 90% satisfactory or above, the trend appears to be improving. Last year 70% demonstrated satisfactory knowledge of quantitative methods and this year it is 75%. We instituted a faculty led study session for quantitative methods the week before comprehensive exams as a way to help refresh students' memories and to answer questions students might have come up with during their self-directed study. It is too soon to claim the increase was caused by these study sessions, but we are

hopeful that attendance at the study sessions will increase and so will the exam scores. Our students have typically low range GRE scores (most below 50th percentile) in quantitative reasoning, and many come from programs or majors with little, if any, focus on issues dealing with quantitative methods/processes. Raising these scores and meeting this goal may be among our biggest challenges as a program.

Reflective Statement Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
 Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Good! Ambitious but reasonable goals were set and some were met while others were close. For those places where the goals were not specifically met, thoughtful analysis and explanation is offered.

Attachments:[Top](#)**Outcome: 3**

At least 90% of students will demonstrate satisfactory or above satisfactory knowledge of qualitative research methods. (N=approx. 25).

Measure: 3.1

A panel of three faculty will judge 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.

Result:

N = 31

Above Satisfactory = 13% (n = 4)

Satisfactory = 54% (n = 19)

Below Satisfactory = 23% (n = 8)

77% of students taking comprehensive examinations demonstrated satisfactory knowledge of qualitative research methods.

Goal not met on this measure.

Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
 Satisfactory

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.

Result:

N = 2

Above Satisfactory = 1

Satisfactory = 1

Below Satisfactory = 0

100% of students writing a thesis using a qualitative methodology demonstrated satisfactory knowledge of qualitative research methods.

Goal met on this measure.

Review:

Revision or explanation needed

Satisfactory

Reflective Statement:

81% of students overall demonstrated satisfactory knowledge of qualitative research methods.

Goal not met.

This is the second year we have included a measure of student knowledge of qualitative research methods. Last year we met our goal and this year we did not. We plan to monitor results for this outcome as we move forward and then take action if we continue to miss our goal in subsequent years.

Reflective Statement Review:

Revision or explanation needed

Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Good! Ambitious but reasonable goals were set and some were met. For those places where the goals were not specifically met, thoughtful analysis and/or explanation is offered with a promise to monitor closely next cycle.

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. (N=approx 10)

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.

Result:

N=5

Above Satisfactory = 2

Satisfactory = 1

N/A = 2

100% of those who answered rated their preparation as satisfactory or above.

Goal Met.

Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
 Satisfactory

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.

Result:

N=5

Above Satisfactory = 1

Satisfactory = 1

Below Satisfactory = 1

N/A = 2

66% of former students who answered the question rated their preparation as satisfactory or above.

Goal not met.

Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
 Satisfactory

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.

Result:

Only one former student replied to this item. The student suggested that the person teaching the qualitative research methods only talked about one method and spent much of the class talking about culture instead of qualitative research methods. The student further said that s/he learned more about qual methods from an instructor in a different course in which students were required to use a qualitative method in analyzing data.

Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
 Satisfactory

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.

Result:

N=3

All three students responding to the survey published or presented original research while a student in our program.

Goal Met

Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
 Satisfactory

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.

Result:

This is the same as measure 4.3. I'm not sure how we missed this duplication.

Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
 Satisfactory

Reflective Statement:

We have some mixed support in the results for measuring this outcome. One problem, aside from having few students go on for doctoral degrees in the last couple years, is the timing of assessment reporting this year. Because we needed to report before the beginning of the school year, two of the students accepted for doctoral work answered N/A to the questions regarding

perceptions of preparedness for doctoral work. We are considering moving the date of our annual alumni survey to around February so that our former students can make more informed decisions. Also, the small sample makes interpreting results very difficult. We can't be sure whether the one person who was dissatisfied with their level of preparation in research methods. Given that past years' students have been relatively satisfied with their preparation, we will be sure to monitor this issue in the future to make sure this is not an evolving trend with our students who go on to doctoral programs. We are also happy that all of the students who responded affirmatively to the item regarding publishing/presenting research while in our program.

Reflective Statement Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
 Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Result under Measure 4.3 is regrettably based only one respondent so is of limited value.

The reflective statement shows thoughtful analysis of the significance of the assessment results.

The e-mail survey cited in several measures might be a good attachment so those reviewing could see what respondents to that survey see. Recommend inclusion for future.

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.

Result:

N=34

Item: "Completion of the Communication M.A. program has had (will have) a favorable impact on my professional advancement."

Strongly agree or agree = 88% (n=30)

Neither agree nor disagree = 6% (n = 2)

Strongly disagree or disagree = 6% (n=2)

Goal met.

Review:

- Revision or explanation needed

Satisfactory

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.

Result:

N=34

Item: "The information and skills I learned in the Communication M.A. program can be applied to one or more professional settings."

Strongly Agree or Agree = 82% (n=28)

Neither Agree or Disagree = 12% (n=4)

Strongly disagree or disagree = 6% (n = 2)

Goal Met.

Review:

Revision or explanation needed

Satisfactory

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.

Result:

We received 23 responses. Three main areas of weakness emerged:

1. A few of the participants wanted more emphasis on how the information could be applied in practical work environments. This is an on-going issue with our students, many of whom are coming to graduate school in the hopes of learning practical skills related to the professional practice of public relations, which is something our undergraduate program in public relations is tasked to do.
2. A second group of students felt that the quantitative and statistics courses were of little value to them outside of the graduate program.
3. Some students said they felt lost and didn't receive enough guidance in finding ways to be involved in research, in their understanding of the thesis/nonthesis options, and ways in which their graduate education can be used to help them enter or advance in the workforce.

Review:

Revision or explanation needed

Satisfactory

Reflective Statement:

We are pleased that the historical trend indicates our recent alumni perceive our program to be valuable and relevant to their professional experiences. Given the response to the scale items indicate students perceive our program to be relevant to their professional experience, we are confused that the most often cited weakness in our program is the lack of practical application of information. On the one hand, we are not overly concerned about this criticism because we are not a professional program so we try to make clear right away that we focus on academic and theoretical approaches to the field. On the other hand, the open ended responses tend to contradict the scaled response items so we are not entirely sure how to interpret the contradiction or what, if any, response this calls for. We have made several recent moves to increase opportunities for professionals by adding courses and programs like Organizational Communication and the Graduate Certificate in Corporate Communication.

Perhaps as students move through these courses and programs, we will see diminishing numbers of alumni citing lack of practical application as a weakness in our program. If the trend of contradicting information continues, we may need to add additional probes for information in our alumni survey, or even hold some focus group sessions, to determine why this contradiction in our data exists.

Finally, in response to many of these concerns we have taken two actions. First, we have instituted a new student orientation session the week before classes begin in the fall of each year. We include some social time so students can connect with each other as well as covering some of the issues that seem to cause confusion, such as the thesis/nonthesis option. This has limited potential, however, because only about 1/3 of the new students have been attending the orientation. Second, we are submitting a course action request and a program action request to add an "introduction to graduate studies in communication" course in the spring of 2013. All students will be required to take the course in their first nine hours. The course includes a strong set of readings, exercises, and assignments to help them develop their writing and literature review skills. We also will spend time helping students discover the job opportunities for them in the communication field and we will help students planning on going on to a doctoral degree understand strategies to improve their success in being admitted to a top program.

Reflective Statement Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
 Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

A detailed thoughtful analysis of results is presented in the Reflective Statement. The program has set reasonable and ambitious goals and obviously seeks to meet them.

Attachments:[Top](#)**Outcome: 6**

At least 90% of graduates will demonstrate satisfactory critical/analytical thinking skills (N=approx 25). Rubric for outcome 5, measures (1) and (2) Above Satisfactory: Demonstrates critical/analytical ability by interrelating areas of research; provides well reasoned criticisms of the research; uses critical analysis to develop a logical rationale for one or more hypotheses or research questions. Satisfactory: Demonstrates critical/analytical ability by interrelating areas of the research; provides well reasoned criticisms of the research; needs to go further in use of critical analysis to develop a logical rationale for one or more hypotheses or research questions. Below Satisfactory: Fails to either adequately interrelate areas of the research or to make well reasoned criticisms of the research.

Measure: 6.1

A panel of three faculty will judge the past year's comprehensive exams in mass communication theory and modern communication theory for critical thinking skills as above satisfactory, satisfactory, or below satisfactory. (These exams are appropriate for this measure because students are required to critically analyze research, draw conclusions, and suggest research directions).

Result:

N = 31

Above Satisfactory = 15

Satisfactory = 12

Below Satisfactory = 4

93% of students who completed comprehensive examinations demonstrated satisfactory critical thinking skills.

Goal met on this measure.

Review:

Revision or explanation needed

Satisfactory

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.

Result:

N = 4

Above Satisfactory = 1

Satisfactory = 2

Below Satisfactory = 1

75% of students writing a thesis demonstrated satisfactory critical thinking skills.

Goal not met on this measure.

Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
 Satisfactory

Reflective Statement:

90% of students overall demonstrated satisfactory critical thinking skills.

Goal met.

The small number of thesis students makes a clear program evaluation difficult on measure 6.2. However, the overall goal of 90% of students demonstrating satisfactory critical thinking skills was met. This is a goal we continue to meet so at this time, we plan to spend more time looking ways to improve our unmet goals.

Reflective Statement Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
 Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Good. Data collected, analyzed, and where appropriate, possible action planned and/or undertaken.

Attachments:

Top

Outcome: 7

Graduates will demonstrate satisfactory communication skills on the following measures (N=approx. 25):

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. 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

Result:

N = 24

Above Satisfactory = 11

Satisfactory = 11

Below Satisfactory = 2

91% of students submitting writing samples demonstrated satisfactory written communication skills.

Goal met.

Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
 Satisfactory

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 an average of 5.5 on a 7 point scale on the CCQ for a satisfactory assessment.

Result:

N=11

Mean = 6.19 on 7 point scale.

9 out of 11 scored above 5.5/7 or above on the Communicator Competence Questionnaire as rated by their intern supervisors.

Goal met.

Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
 Satisfactory

Reflective Statement:

We are cautiously optimistic about the results of measuring students' written and verbal communication skills. This is the first year we measured students' written skills using samples of their writing for our courses. We met our goal by 91% of our students demonstrating satisfactory writing skill. We plan to monitor results in coming assessment periods to determine a trend over time before considering programmatic changes. The results of intern supervisors' evaluations of our students' communication skills met our program goal. We will continue to monitor our students' progress and make changes as necessary if/when we begin seeing declines.

This year we only included our interns, next year we intend to also include our GTAs in our data set.

Reflective Statement Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
 Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Good. This all appears sufficiently rigorous and appropriate. It might be good to include some mention of how students are selected for internships. Is this a fair and random sample? How many students are excluded from this measure?

Attachments:

Changes to Academic Process:

- Modify Frequency or Schedule of Course Offerings
- Make Technology Related Improvements
- Make Personnel Related Changes
- Implement Additional Training
- Revise Advising Standards or Process
- Revise Admission Criteria
- Other implemented or planned change
- No Changes to Academic Process

Explain EACH item checked above:

At this point we are meeting most of our goals so we do not intend to make any major changes in our academic processes. One change we do intend to make is to revise our benchmarks for GRE exams so we look at verbal and quantitative reasoning separately. We think some students have met minimum admission benchmarks on the combined scores by balancing out low quantitative scores with high verbal scores. This may be part of the problem with our students' ability to pass the comprehensive examinations in the quantitative methods area.

Changes to Curriculum:

- Revise and/or Enforce Prerequisites
- Revise Course Sequence
- Revise Course Content
- Add Course
- Delete Course
- Other implemented or planned change
- No Changes to Curriculum

Explain EACH item checked above:

We plan to make some changes to our curriculum based on our assessment data. First, our alumni survey indicates students do not always have a good idea about what is expected of them, how to get involved in research, or how to translate their program experience into their chosen professional field. We are applying to add an "Introduction to Graduate Study in Communication" based on this feedback. We also are going to hold meetings regarding revisions to the quantitative research methods courses. Right now we have separate courses for Mass and Interpersonal Communication. Informally, the faculty

Criteria:

Please comment on implemented and planned changes

- Clear statement of change(s)
- Description of how changes created improvements; make suggestions for future cycles

Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
- Satisfactory

Review

Comments:

This is all quite reasonable and looks well thought out.

teaching these courses believe that the content overlaps enough to simply offer one course that would be open to students in both tracks. This should help make the content of these courses more uniform across sections and improve students ability to work together in study groups in preparation for the comprehensive exams.

Changes to Assessment Plan:

- Revise Student Outcome Statement
- Revise Measurement Approach
- Collect and Analyze Additional Data and Information
- Change Method of Data Collection
- Other Planned Changes
- Plan has been reviewed and no change made
- No Changes to Assessment Plan

Explain EACH item checked above:

We plan to make the following changes to our assessment plan:

1. Right now we measure knowledge of literature in the field by looking at answers to the comprehensive exam question regarding theory. We think these questions are sometimes too narrow to evaluate a broader knowledge of the literature in our field. We plan to change this to students pass rate on the elective area questions. Each student must answer questions from two different courses in their elective plan of study. Our new measurement will be that 90% of students will pass both elective answers on their first attempt. Since the elective courses often represent the breadth of information in our field, we think this will give us a better idea of how well our students are learning outside the core of theory and methods.
2. The workload of having so many people reading so many exam questions and writing samples is becoming burdensome. We will propose that we sample 15 writing samples, 15 quantitative exam answers, and 15 qualitative exam answers at random as a representative sample of student learning. This should satisfy the demands of both obtaining adequate data for assessing program outcomes along while at the same time lifting some of the workload from the faculty. A sample of 15 represents around 50% of the total population of exam responses and writing samples.

Curriculum/Course-related Assessment Methods:

- Capstone Course
- Capstone Project or Performance Evaluation
- Case study / Simulation
- Course-embedded Questions
- Portfolio
- Rating Scale / Scoring Rubric (yields a grade)
- Assessment Rubrics (student demonstrates proficiency)

- Lab Journals / Reports
- Observation (focused on specific program outcomes)
- Other method

Explain EACH item checked above:

No changes

Examinations/Tests:**Standardized:**

- Nationally-normed Exam
- State-normed Exam
- Other

Explain EACH item checked above:

N/A

Local:

- Post-test Only
- Pre-post Test
- Other exam or test

Explain EACH item checked above:

N/A

Surveys:**Institution (UCF):**

- UCF Graduating Student Survey (Seniors or Graduate student)
- Alumni Survey
- Student Satisfaction Survey
- First Destination Survey
- Employee Survey

Explain EACH item checked above:**Local:**

- Alumni Survey (Department or Program; not UCF)
- Customer Satisfaction Survey

Exit and Other Interviews

Explain EACH item checked above:

We use an alumni survey for two of the outcomes.

Other Survey(s):

National Survey

State Survey

Other Survey

Explain EACH item checked above:

N/A

Miscellaneous Assessment Methods:

Advisory Board

Focus Group

Institutional Data

Student Records

Accreditation Reviews (e.e. SACS, NCATE, ABET)

Other

Explain EACH item checked above:

N/A

Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Results Rubric

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

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

Indicators:

1. Complete and relevant data are provided for all measures OR if data are incomplete or missing, an explanation is provided

2. Data reporting is thorough (see below)

i.e., populations are defined; sampling methods and response rates are provided with survey data, etc.

3. Results for each measure indicate whether the target for that measure has been met

4. Reflective statements are provided either for each outcome or aggregated for multiple outcomes

5. Implemented and planned changes are included and are linked to assessment data, or if no changes are reported, an explanation is provided

6. Assessment instruments are attached or linked to if not proprietary

Additional Indicators:

- 7. Includes description of how the assessment process has been useful to your program or unit
- 8. Includes description of how IE Assessment has resulted in quality improvement initiatives
- 9. Data collection and analysis are used to assess the impact of implemented changes, demonstrating a fully "closed loop" process

Summary of Assessment Process:

Think about the last few years and describe evidence-based changes that have taken place because of assessment. Also address other factors that have caused changes to be made (e.g., state mandate, accreditation review recommendations).

One of a series of on-going changes to our program based on survey, exit, and enrollment data has been the creation of the Certificate Program in Corporate Communication. Alumni survey data especially has led us to create this program. Many of the alumni said one of the program shortcomings involved opportunities for applying information from the program to practical situations they might encounter as professionals in the communication field. The addition of the certificate focusing on courses with more applicability to professional settings was a response to this perceived need.

Another change has been the addition of a systematic attempt to hold review sessions for quantitative methods exams each semester. So far, it appears this is refreshing students understanding well enough to improve the pass rate on the exams as well as the judgments of students' responses in the assessment process. We also think that the creation of a field specific statistics course in conjunction with the Statistics program has helped as well because it provides students more training in quantitative methods within the context of the field they are familiar with.

Data from assessment also helps us keep tabs on things we that appear to be going well. The students that move from our program into doctoral programs have, so far, all met with success. One recent alumni has taken her first tenure track job at Texas Tech. Our assessment data indicates that our students are succeeding at the next level. We were somewhat concerned about using student submitted writing samples because we thought the assessment scores would go down, but they have stayed within our target numbers. Our faculty expresses their feeling that they seem to see more examples of poor writing than in the assessment data. One reason for this is that the rigors of our program probably weeds out the truly terrible writers so that they never make it to the point where they will be taking comprehensive exams, so we only see the students who have succeeded in our program in our assessment data. This provides us with some indirect evidence that our program does provide a rigorous academic experience to our students.

Data from assessment also helps us to spot some warning signs. This was the first year our students were assessed in the area of qualitative research methods. We did not meet our goal in this area. We thought our students' problems in quantitative methods, as measured in our assessment, originated from less experience with math as undergrads. That cannot really explain their deficiency in qualitative methods. We plan to monitor these results next year to determine whether we stepped into an uncharacteristic year or whether this is indeed a trend. Once we have another year's worth of data, we can look at some possibilities for improving our students performance in this area as well.

Review Criteria:

(Examples: Could you be more specific? Has your benchmark remained at this level too long?)

Revision or explanation needed

Satisfactory

Review:

Nicely done. This was a pleasure to read and the program has obviously benefited from the work the faculty have done to gather and analyze the data.