

UCF Assessment

Assessment Plan and Results

Plan Year: 2014-2015 ▼ Status: Results Approved for DRC Report
 Program/Unit: Advertising/Public Relations - B.A. ▼ Last Updated: 12/2/2015 3:30:36 PM

We strongly recommend not copying directly from Microsoft Word or Excel to the rich text boxes as the text being copied may contain html and/or xml code which may hinder how the document is viewed. We suggest to first paste the text to notepad, then copy the text from notepad to the rich text box.

Revised UCF IE Assessment Rubrics - 2013-2014 Plans onward
 Assessment Coordinator Instructions

View/Submit Results Review  2013-2014 Results Review

Program/Unit:	Advertising/Public Relations - B.A.	DRC:	College of Sciences
Year:	2014-2015	DRC Chair:	Elizabeth Grauerholz
Due Date:	09/23/2015	Coordinator(s):	Kim Tuorto, Boyd Lindsley, Joan McCain
		Reviewer(s):	David Gay

Quick Links:

Mission:

The mission of the Advertising-Public Relations program is to prepare students for careers in the widely diverse fields of advertising and public relations by educating students in the fundamental concepts, strategies, and techniques of strategic communication that facilitate organizational and societal outcomes. Our stakeholders are our students, the professional community that hire our graduates, and our alumni.

Assessment Process:

Our assessment strategies are designed to measure student understanding and mastery of the values and competencies outlined by our discipline's leading accrediting body: the Association of Educators in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC). The plan includes direct and indirect measures for mastery of skills, understanding of concepts, creative ability, and effective teamwork practices. The direct measures are accomplished by faculty implementation of pre- and post-test in lecture classes (Dr. Timothy Coombs, Dr. Sherry Holladay, Ms. Lindsay Hudock, Ms. Joan McCain) ADV 3008, PUR 4000, MMC 3420, and PUR 3210; faculty observation of student performance (Dr. Denise DeLorme, Ms. Joan McCain, Dr. Melissa Dodd, Ms. Lindsay Hudock) in ADV 4101, MMC 4411, and PUR 4801; and completion of rubrics in skills courses, (Ms. Joan McCain, Ms. Lindsay Hudock, Dr. Melissa Dodd, Dr. Denise DeLorme) in ADV 4101, MMC 3630, MMC 4411, and PUR 3100; professional panels evaluating student portfolios (alumni and members of the major's advisory board); as well as industry professionals completing assessment forms for the interns they supervise in a semester (a key stakeholder group). Surveys completed by students completing internship also contribute to indirect measures (another key stakeholder).

Relationship to Strategic Plan:

Our outcomes related to journalistic style writing, which are assessed by faculty and by professionals

who hire our interns, directly links to the University's Goal 1: Offer the best undergraduate education available in Florida. Our large and popular internship program, measured in several outcomes, links to the University's Goal 5: Be America's leading partnership University.

Top

Outcome: 1

Students will exhibit the ability to present proposals, plans and strategies in settings appropriate to their career paths.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

- ☒ Communication
- ☒ Critical Thinking
- ☒ Discipline-specific knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors
- ☐ Not an ALC

Measure: 1.1

Students will be able to present proposals, plans, and strategies in ADV 4101, PUR 3100, and MMC 4411. Student work will be evaluated by faculty observation and 70% will score a 3.0 or higher on a 5-point scale.

Result:

Accurate and thorough data reporting means: a. Report data for all students or other constituents; b. Report data that matches data requirements established by a measure (i.e., your assessment must measure what you set out to measure); c. Report granular and aggregate results (e.g., subscale and total scores from a rubric or exam); d. Response rates are provided for survey data; e. The underlying "n" and "N" are provided for all percentage statistics and if a change score is provided the data points to support the score are included; f. Representative samples should include data from students at a distance (regional campuses or online/video) if courses are offered at these locations/through these modalities.

- ☒ Target met
- ☐ Target not met

Unfortunately PUR 3100 this past year was taught by adjuncts and the data was not collected. In ADV 4101 Advertising Copywriting: N=10 groups, 2 out of 10 rated 5; 3 out of 10 rated 4; 3 out of 10 rated 3; 2 out of 10 rated 2; 0 rated 1; total 80% (8 out of 10) earned a 3.0 or higher. In MMC 4411 Ad/PR Campaigns: N = 7 groups, 1 out 7 rated 5; 4 out of 7 rated 4; 2 out of 7 rated 3; 0 rated 2 or 1; total 100% (7 out of 7) earned a 3.0 or higher. Therefore, overall 88.2% (15 out of 17) earned 3.0 or higher on presenting their proposals, plans and strategies by faculty observation. The target was met, however last year ADV 4101 N=8 and 100% met the target. We believe the decrease this year in ADV 4101 is due largely to a new interpretation of the rubric. A committee of instructors met after last year's assessment results to create agreement on how assess the work and comply with the rubric. However, adjunct faculty were not available for the discussions on assessing work and use of the rubric, which may have accounted for this year's decrease. This reinforces the need to be sure all faculty are applying the same standards and interpretation of the rubric. We are pleased the senior level students in MMC 4411 achieved 100%, especially since data for this course was not available last year.

Did your results show an improvement compared to previous year(s) results?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

If yes, describe the improvement by giving a comparison with previous year's results. If

no, please explain:

The quality of the work did not change significantly year over year.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 1.2

Students will be able to present proposals, plans and strategies based on assigned projects in ADV 4101 and MMC 4411. 75% of campaign books, reports, or projects from each class will receive a 4.0 rating or higher after review by a panel of industry professionals who will complete rubrics on a 5-point scale.

Result:

Accurate and thorough data reporting means: a. Report data for all students or other constituents; b. Report data that matches data requirements established by a measure (i.e., your assessment must measure what you set out to measure); c. Report granular and aggregate results (e.g., subscale and total scores from a rubric or exam); d. Response rates are provided for survey data; e. The underlying "n" and "N" are provided for all percentage statistics and if a change score is provided the data points to support the score are included; f. Representative samples should include data from students at a distance (regional campuses or online/video) if courses are offered at these locations/through these modalities.

- ☐ Target met
- ☒ Target not met

After a number of assessment cycles of meeting our target, in 2013-2014 we increased our rating for this measure from 3.0 to 4.0. Last year in ADV 4101 N=8: 6 out of 8 (75%) achieved a rating of 4.0 or higher; and in PUR 3100 7 out of 8 (87%) also achieved a rating of 4.0 or better; Total N=16: 13 out of 16 (81%) achieved a rating of 4.0 or better, so the target of 75% was met. ~~only that 75% of the target was reached. So we did not have specific percentages to compare this year.~~ This year's INDUSTRY PROFESSIONAL REVIEW N = 6 ADV 4101: 4 out of 6 (67%) achieved 4.0 or higher; N = 0 PUR 3100 N/A; N = 7 MMC 4411: 5 out of 7 (71%) achieved 4.0 or higher; Total N = 13: Overall 9 out of 13 (69%) achieved 4.0 or higher. The target was not met. As we did not reach the target in either of the two courses (PUR 3100 was taught by an adjunct and no data was collected), this is a concern. ~~In ADV 4101: Advertising Copywriting, 66% (4 out of 6) earned a 4.0 or higher; in PUR 4411: Ad/PR Campaigns, 71% earned 4.0 or higher; therefore 69% earned a 4.0 or higher on presenting their proposals, plans and strategies to industry professionals. We believe the decrease this year may be due to lackluster performance in one section of ADV 4101. There was a new adjunct in the course, and the rigor standards in the course are questionable. In reviewing the granular data we had two groups in each year that only achieved a rating of 3.0 in the ADV 4101 course. Also in PUR 3011 last year, one group only achieved a 3.0 rating and this year in the MMC 4411 two groups also only achieved a 3.0 rating. Although we have only had the 4.0 rating for two assessment cycles, we believe there is an issue that needs to be addressed. Analyzing the data seems to reflect that we need to determine why we have some students in all three classes not meeting the minimum rating of 4.0. We will need to isolate the variables and see if this is a communication issue (expectations are not clear) or if the students are not as prepared as we had hoped.~~

Did your results show an improvement compared to previous year(s) results?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

If yes, describe the improvement by giving a comparison with previous year's results. If

no, please explain:

Although we have only had the 4.0 rating for two assessment cycles, we believe there is an issue that needs to be addressed. Analyzing the data seems to reflect that we need to determine why we have some students in all three classes not meeting the minimum rating of 4.0. We will need to isolate the variables and see if this is a communication issue (expectations are not clear) or if the students are not as prepared as we had hoped.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Reflective Statement:

Analyze and discuss your results by: a. Why do you think you got the results that you did; b. If you saw improvement from last year, explain exactly what improved and how do you know that it is an improvement (give prior year's results and this year's results to demonstrate the change). Verify that the improvement was a consequence of a strategy or change implemented in prior year(s); and c. Provide an improvement plan, if required (e.g., Discuss additional student learning or operational changes you will implement in response to these results).

Discussions with the faculty have indicated that perhaps the interpretations of the rubric may vary between the faculty and professionals. Perhaps we can more clearly identify for both groups the criteria. We may also need to clarify expectations to the students as well. ~~We also have a new faculty member who will replace the adjunct with low rigor standards in ADV 4101.~~ As we realized we did have granular data as an attachment in last year's results, we were able to look more closely at the granular data. In analyzing past and current assessment data for this outcome we believe we need to make changes to the rubric. The rubric rating scale increased by one was: ideas were presented, visuals enhanced, point clearly articulated, objectives stated and met, high degree of quality, were present in the books. However, only the highest rating referenced the quality. Perhaps, this caused some ambiguity in interpretation for the reviewer's and/or faculty members. During the next cycle we will make changes to the rubric to better assess the students' work. We will also be sure expectations are made clear to the students as well. We are also working on improving data collection; hopefully we will have less turnover of faculty this year and have met to discuss the data that will need to be collected in the next cycle.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

I am not sure it is a good idea to identify particular faculty. Faculty members change (i.e., move on or teach different classes). Industry professionals are presented in a generic fashion (i.e., industry professionals), and I would suggest the same strategy for faculty. For measure 1.2, do you have a long term plan for the course with "questionable standards?" In addition, do you have a strategy for data collection to address the limitations you described. Are you planning to collect "year-over-year" data? The attachments were helpful. DG

- Zack's notes 11/4/15
- Overall good data reporting.
- the reviewer raises some good questions regarding new strategies. It seems that the program plans to address the evaluator side first by getting everyone on the same page with the rubrics. This is fine, just don't forget to consider things you can do to improve student performance as well.

The revisions provide clarity. DG 12/1/15

Attachments: Measure 1.1 overall results table.docx Measure 1.2 overall results table.docx

Top

Outcome: 2

Students will demonstrate the ability to work in teams.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

- ☒ Communication
- ☒ Critical Thinking
- ☒ Discipline-specific knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors
- ☐ Not an ALC

Measure: 2.1

Students will perform satisfactorily in team projects. 70% of students will receive 7 points out of 10 on peer evaluation forms completed by team members.

Result:

Accurate and thorough data reporting means: a. Report data for all students or other constituents; b. Report data that matches data requirements established by a measure (i.e., your assessment must measure what you set out to measure); c. Report granular and aggregate results (e.g., subscale and total scores from a rubric or exam); d. Response rates are provided for survey data; e. The underlying "n" and "N" are provided for all percentage statistics and if a change score is provided the data points to support the score are included; f. Representative samples should include data from students at a distance (regional campuses or online/video) if courses are offered at these locations/through these modalities.

- ☒ Target met
- ☐ Target not met

Students complete peer evaluations to rate their team members on professional behavior (1 point), punctuality and attendance (2 points), collaborative participation (2 points), responsiveness to emails or calls or texts (2 points), and timely submission of project materials (3 points). N = 5 groups in ADV 4101: Advertising Copywriting, or a total of 20 students evaluating team members. Target was met, and exceeded as 100% of students were rated with 7 points or higher. In MMC 4411 N = 7 groups, 35 students, groups scored 35 points out of 35 points (100%) for professional behavior, 59 points out of 70 points (84%) for being punctual and consistent meeting attendance, 61 points out of 70 points (89%) for collaborative participation, 58 points out of 70 points (82%) for responsiveness to emails, calls, texts, 91 points out of 105 points (86%) for timely submission of materials, total 304 points out of 350 points 86% received 7 out of 10 or higher. Therefore the target of 70% was met in both courses. Scores this year were identical to last year's in ADV 4101. We did not assess MMC 4411 last year for this measure. We believe that the results are high in part, certainly, to students behaving appropriately, motivated by being rated by their peers, and that rating impacting their project grade. However, faculty observation indicates these ratings are inflated. We believe students don't feel comfortable giving each other low ratings. The granular data in MMC 4411 shows that the students rated their peers the lowest (82%) on responsiveness to emails, calls and texts and second lowest (84%) on punctuality and consistent meeting attendance.

Did your results show an improvement compared to previous year(s) results?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

If yes, describe the improvement by giving a comparison with previous year's results. If

no, please explain:

The results were identical to last year's.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 2.2

Students will demonstrate effective teamwork behavior. Students in internships (ADV 4941 and PUR 4941) will be evaluated for teamwork by their internship supervisors using a 4-point scale of Outstanding, Very Good, Needs Improvement, Unsatisfactory. 75% will receive Very Good or Outstanding.

Result:

Accurate and thorough data reporting means: a. Report data for all students or other constituents; b. Report data that matches data requirements established by a measure (i.e., your assessment must measure what you set out to measure); c. Report granular and aggregate results (e.g., subscale and total scores from a rubric or exam); d. Response rates are provided for survey data; e. The underlying "n" and "N" are provided for all percentage statistics and if a change score is provided the data points to support the score are included; f. Representative samples should include data from students at a distance (regional campuses or online/video) if courses are offered at these locations/through these modalities.

- ☒ Target met
- ☐ Target not met

SPONSOR EVALUATIONS Spring 2014 N= 109; 84 of 109 rated Outstanding; 24 of 109 rated Very Good; 1 of 109 rated Needs Improvement; 0 of 109 rated Unsatisfactory; Spring 2014 Results: 108 out of 109 (99%) were rated Very Good or Outstanding, Target met for Spring. Fall 2014 N = 59; 43 of 59 rated Outstanding; 14 of 59 rated Very Good; 2 of 59 rated Needs Improvement; 0 of 59 rated Unsatisfactory; Fall 2014 Results: 57 out of 59 (96%) were rated Very Good or Outstanding, Target met for Fall. N = 168 for Academic Year totals; 127 of 168 rated Outstanding; 38 of 168 rated Very Good; 3 of 168 rated Needs Improvement; 0 of 168 rated Unsatisfactory; 165 out of 168 (98.2%) rated Very Good or Outstanding, Target met for the year.

Did your results show an improvement compared to previous year(s) results?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

If yes, describe the improvement by giving a comparison with previous year's results. If no, please explain:

There was no improvement. But if we compared only the Spring semester as we reported last year, there was only a .2% decrease. This year we collected data for both Fall and Spring semesters, resulting in 168 students evaluated and 98.2% were rated very good or outstanding.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Reflective Statement:

Analyze and discuss your results by: a. Why do you think you got the results that you did; b. If you saw improvement from last year, explain exactly what improved and how do you know that it is an

improvement (give prior year's results and this year's results to demonstrate the change). Verify that the improvement was a consequence of a strategy or change implemented in prior year(s); and c. Provide an improvement plan, if required (e.g., Discuss additional student learning or operational changes you will implement in response to these results).

Students seem to be scoring very high on their ability to work in teams. We could stretch the target, but it looks like that would be easily achieved. We also discussed more accountability with the course instructors, rather than students reporting on each other, to get more truthful input. But the faculty didn't like the militancy of that plan, and we felt is is peer analysis that was the most applicable to their careers, and faculty observation would remove that. Replacing this measure is the most likely for next year's assessment.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

The department appears to have met their goals for Measure 2.2. It would be helpful for reviewers if punctuation was used in the reporting of evaluations. The attachment was helpful. DG

- Zack's notes 11/4/15
 - Again overall good results reporting
 - 2.1 - I would like to see the granular/disaggregate data... The students rate eachother in 5 different areas it would be interesting to see the scores each of the different areas. This may also help the program determine which areas need to be addressed to create improvement. Is there a particular area in which students rated eachother lower than in the other areas.
 - Also a copy of the student peer evaluation form should be attached in the future (not the results just the form/rubric students use in evaluating eachother).
- The additional data enhance the report. DG 12/1/15

Attachments: Measure 2.2 Spring 2014.docx Measure2 1.docx

Top

Outcome: 3

Students will demonstrate an understanding of quantitative and qualitative research methods and basic statistical analysis.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

- ☐ Communication
- ☒ Critical Thinking
- ☒ Discipline-specific knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors
- ☐ Not an ALC

Measure: 3.1

Students will demonstrate the ability to use appropriate research methodology in course work. A representative sample of campaign projects from ADV 4101 and final project books from MMC 4411 will be reviewed by an industry panel for effective use of qualitative research. 70% of students will score a 3.0 on a 5-point scale or higher.

Result:

Accurate and thorough data reporting means: a. Report data for all students or other constituents; b. Report data that matches data requirements established by a measure (i.e., your assessment must measure what you set out to measure); c. Report granular and aggregate results (e.g.,

subscale and total scores from a rubric or exam); d. Response rates are provided for survey data; e. The underlying "n" and "N" are provided for all percentage statistics and if a change score is provided the data points to support the score are included; f. Representative samples should include data from students at a distance (regional campuses or online/video) if courses are offered at these locations/through these modalities.

- ☒ Target met
- ☐ Target not met

Using a scale where 1 = research present; 2 = research present, cited and summarized; 3 = research present, cited and summarized and appropriate for project and objective; 4 = research present, cited and summarized, appropriate for project and objective; 5 = research present, cited and summarized, appropriate for project and objective, additionally it was smartly organized and visually appealing the books were reviewed by an industry panel. ADV 4101: N = 6 projects, 24 students in ADV 4101 2 out of 6 rated 5; 2 out of 6 rated 4; 1 out of 6 rated 3; 1 out of 6 rated 2; 0 out of 6 rated 1; Total: 5 out of 6 (83%) rated 3.0 or higher. In MMC 4411 N = 6 projects, 24 students in MMC 4411 2 out of 6 rated 5; 2 out of 6 rated 4; 1 out of 6 rated 3; 0 out of 6 rated 2; 1 out of 6 rated 1; Total: 5 out of 6 (83%) rated 3.0 or higher. Last year we just reported that more than 70% of students scored a 3.0 on a 5-point scale or higher for appropriate research methodology used in ADV 4101: Advertising Copywriting, no data had been collected for MMC 4411 in the prior year. Although we don't have the specific percentage above 70% from last year, we do believe the 83% rated as 3.0 or higher in both courses (with a larger sample) is an increase over last year.

Did your results show an improvement compared to previous year(s) results?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

If yes, describe the improvement by giving a comparison with previous year's results. If no, please explain:

Yes, this may show an improvement. Last year the specific target was not reported, only that it was above 70%. We are attempting to report more granular data to help more accurately measure outcome.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 3.2

80% of students in MMC 3420 (Mass Media Research Methods) will demonstrate a knowledge of sound research methodology. Students will fill out pre-test surveys with one question on research terminology, processes, or functions that will be explained and demonstrated later in the term, and post-test will be conducted to test their understanding and awareness level of same.

Result:

Accurate and thorough data reporting means: a. Report data for all students or other constituents; b. Report data that matches data requirements established by a measure (i.e., your assessment must measure what you set out to measure); c. Report granular and aggregate results (e.g., subscale and total scores from a rubric or exam); d. Response rates are provided for survey data; e. The underlying "n" and "N" are provided for all percentage statistics and if a change score is provided the data points to support the score are included; f. Representative samples should include data from students at a distance (regional campuses or online/video) if courses are offered at these locations/through these modalities.

- ☐ Target met
- ☒ Target not met

A change in faculty between last academic year and this academic year resulted in no data being collected for this measure. **This past year a greater emphasis was placed on research skills.** The course was overhauled and is being delivered differently, so the results would not have been extremely relevant or useful. **We have submitted curriculum changes for the 2016-2017 catalog year for the prerequisite to be changed to Mass Communication majors and minors. The course will focus on applied research, in addition to theory to align more with the research skill students/graduates will need in their internships and their careers.** We are collecting data this academic year to report in next year's assessment. We did notice an increase in student performance on 3.1 data which may also be as a result of the changes to this course as they begin to be implemented.

Did your results show an improvement compared to previous year(s) results?

- ☐ Yes
☒ No

If yes, describe the improvement by giving a comparison with previous year's results. If no, please explain:

No data.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Reflective Statement:

Analyze and discuss your results by: a. Why do you think you got the results that you did; b. If you saw improvement from last year, explain exactly what improved and how do you know that it is an improvement (give prior year's results and this year's results to demonstrate the change). Verify that the improvement was a consequence of a strategy or change implemented in prior year(s); and c. Provide an improvement plan, if required (e.g., Discuss additional student learning or operational changes you will implement in response to these results).

Our assessment of student's performance over a period of time in this course, has led ~~Having made~~ to changes to MMC 3420: Mass Media Research Methods for the first time in eight years. We are eager to see next year's data. This course is not a favorite among students, but it is a vital part of their career foundation. This will be an area of emphasis with regard to assessment. The curriculum will have more of an emphasis on applied research applications rather than on only theory and will only be open to majors.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

The plan to collect data in the future should provide information to address this issue in the future for measure 3.2. DG

- Zack's notes 11/4/15
- Again overall pretty good reporting of results
- 3.1 - It looks like the data for MMC4411 is incomplete... it appears places were left blank for the data to be plugged in but then the actual numbers were never input.
 - Also is this a group project? is that how 24 students leads to 6 projects being evaluated.? Or is 6 a sample from 24? perhaps this could be clarified?
- 3.2 - okay the explanation is sufficient.

In my opinion, nice job. DG 12/1/15

Attachments: Measure 3.1 with 4411.docx

Top

Outcome: 4

Students will demonstrate the ability to use journalistic style (AP Style) to write material for mass media.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

- ☒ Communication
- ☐ Critical Thinking
- ☒ Discipline-specific knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors
- ☐ Not an ALC

Measure: 4.1

90% of students in PUR 3100 (Writing for PR) will demonstrate a proficiency in AP Style rules. A scored pre-test of AP Style rules and guidelines that will be covered in the course will be administered early in the term. A scored post-test on the same AP Style rules and guidelines will be given at the end of the term. 90% of the students will score a C average or better, and will be 50% better than pre-test results.

Result:

Accurate and thorough data reporting means: a. Report data for all students or other constituents; b. Report data that matches data requirements established by a measure (i.e., your assessment must measure what you set out to measure); c. Report granular and aggregate results (e.g., subscale and total scores from a rubric or exam); d. Response rates are provided for survey data; e. The underlying "n" and "N" are provided for all percentage statistics and if a change score is provided the data points to support the score are included; f. Representative samples should include data from students at a distance (regional campuses or online/video) if courses are offered at these locations/through these modalities.

- ☐ Target met
- ☒ Target not met

All five sections of this essential skills course were taught by adjuncts last term. We have no data to report for this measure.

Did your results show an improvement compared to previous year(s) results?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

If yes, describe the improvement by giving a comparison with previous year's results. If no, please explain:

There is no data.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 4.2

Students will be able to write in a concise, journalistic style. A panel of professionals will review final

portfolios from PUR 3100 and review for journalistic style, rating the work on a 5-point scale. 70% of students will score a 3.0 or higher.

Result:

Accurate and thorough data reporting means: a. Report data for all students or other constituents; b. Report data that matches data requirements established by a measure (i.e., your assessment must measure what you set out to measure); c. Report granular and aggregate results (e.g., subscale and total scores from a rubric or exam); d. Response rates are provided for survey data; e. The underlying "n" and "N" are provided for all percentage statistics and if a change score is provided the data points to support the score are included; f. Representative samples should include data from students at a distance (regional campuses or online/video) if courses are offered at these locations/through these modalities.

- ☐ Target met
- ☒ Target not met

All five sections of this skills course were taught by adjuncts, and data was not collected. So we have no results to report.

Did your results show an improvement compared to previous year(s) results?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

If yes, describe the improvement by giving a comparison with previous year's results. If no, please explain:

There is no data.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Reflective Statement:

Analyze and discuss your results by: a. Why do you think you got the results that you did; b. If you saw improvement from last year, explain exactly what improved and how do you know that it is an improvement (give prior year's results and this year's results to demonstrate the change). Verify that the improvement was a consequence of a strategy or change implemented in prior year(s); and c. Provide an improvement plan, if required (e.g., Discuss additional student learning or operational changes you will implement in response to these results).

PUR 3100: Writing for PR is the most crucial course in our curriculum--this is agreed upon by faculty and the professional community whom hire our graduates. We have hired a new faculty member who has embraced the need for assessment data. He is also looking at new ways to measure the outcomes. We are very eager to see what next year's assessment shows us for this crucial course.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Moving the course to tenure track faculty should alleviate some of these problems for measure 4.2. Future data collection is needed. DG

- Zack's notes 11/4/15

- The assessment nerd in me is sad that no data was collected for this outcome this cycle, since I use this outcome as an example of what a good outcome and measures looks like and we have showcased this outcome at the University Assessment event in the past. :) I hope the change in instructor helps.

Attachments:

Top

Outcome: 5

Students will demonstrate an understanding of the principles, tactics, and how the emerging trend of social media fits into communication strategy.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

- ☐ Communication
- ☒ Critical Thinking
- ☒ Discipline-specific knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors
- ☐ Not an ALC

Measure: 5.1

Students will understand all principles and strengths of various social media tools. A pre-test and post-test will be conducted in the majors-only section of MMC 3630: Social Media as Mass Communication. 75% of students will correctly identify the principles and strengths on post-test.

Result:

Accurate and thorough data reporting means: a. Report data for all students or other constituents; b. Report data that matches data requirements established by a measure (i.e., your assessment must measure what you set out to measure); c. Report granular and aggregate results (e.g., subscale and total scores from a rubric or exam); d. Response rates are provided for survey data; e. The underlying "n" and "N" are provided for all percentage statistics and if a change score is provided the data points to support the score are included; f. Representative samples should include data from students at a distance (regional campuses or online/video) if courses are offered at these locations/through these modalities.

- ☒ Target met
- ☐ Target not met

Student completed a pre-test and post-test in MMC 3630: Social Media as Mass Communication. They were asked about content creation, social media history, the role of social media in professional development, ethical and legal considerations, the role of social media in society, the role of social media in mass communication, their understanding of analytics and measurement, how it fits into communication strategy, theory, and best practices. **The pre-test is used for comparison purposes to the post-test for MMC 3630.**

Fall 2014

Pre-test (N = 39)

The mean score on the pre-test measure was a 2.89 on a 5.0 scale.

Fall 2014

Post-test (N = 30)

The mean score on the post-test rose to 4.08 on a 5.0 scale.

The target was met.

Did your results show an improvement compared to previous year(s) results?

- ☐ Yes
☒ No

If yes, describe the improvement by giving a comparison with previous year's results. If no, please explain:

We did not measure this last year.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 5.2

Students will demonstrate an appropriate use of social media tools in plans and projects in MMC 3630: Social Media as Mass Communication; ADV 4101: Advertising Copywriting, MMC 4411: Ad/PR Campaigns. A review of portfolios of class projects will be reviewed by local professionals who will complete rubrics. 70% of students will earn a 3.0 or higher on a 5.0 scale.

Result:

Accurate and thorough data reporting means: a. Report data for all students or other constituents; b. Report data that matches data requirements established by a measure (i.e., your assessment must measure what you set out to measure); c. Report granular and aggregate results (e.g., subscale and total scores from a rubric or exam); d. Response rates are provided for survey data; e. The underlying "n" and "N" are provided for all percentage statistics and if a change score is provided the data points to support the score are included; f. Representative samples should include data from students at a distance (regional campuses or online/video) if courses are offered at these locations/through these modalities.

- ☐ Target met
☒ Target not met

We did not assess any data for this measure. Faculty neglected to add the social media component to the rubrics. This was an oversight and will be corrected for next year.

Did your results show an improvement compared to previous year(s) results?

- ☐ Yes
☒ No

If yes, describe the improvement by giving a comparison with previous year's results. If no, please explain:

We have no data for this measure.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Reflective Statement:

Analyze and discuss your results by: a. Why do you think you got the results that you did; b. If you saw improvement from last year, explain exactly what improved and how do you know that it is an improvement (give prior year's results and this year's results to demonstrate the change). Verify that the improvement was a consequence of a strategy or change implemented in prior year(s); and c.

Provide an improvement plan, if required (e.g., Discuss additional student learning or operational changes you will implement in response to these results).

Social media is a new part of our curriculum, and it is a growing career path and skill our students needs. We are pleased with this first assessment measure and result we have done. Next year, we plan on doing more to assess students mastery of this skill.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Future data collection is needed to assess these measures, and the program has a plan in place to accomplish this task. DG

- Zack's notes 11/4/15
- 5.1 - I'm curious as to the relevance of the pre-test if your target only focuses on the post-test results... This is fine and you report the pre-test results anyway which is nice for us to make comparisons... just curious really.
 - Was this course only offered in the fall? why no spring data?
 - I would suggest changing the wording of the target in the measure. You report the mean score so I recommend changing the target to something like "The mean score of all students on the post-test will be 75% or better".... the way it is worded now makes it seem like you are going to report the number of students that meet a certain mark. It's just a bit misleading is all.
- explanation is sufficient... there have already been several measures in this report with no data. Please be careful about this in the future.

Pre-test explanation provided. DG 12/1/15

Attachments: Fall 2014 PreTest-1.docx Fall 2014 Post Test MMC 3630-1.docx

Top

Outcome: 6

Students will demonstrate proficiency in performance of core skills performed in their internships. Assessment related to student performance of core skills will be completed by professionals who supervise student interns.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

- ☒ Communication
- ☒ Critical Thinking
- ☒ Discipline-specific knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors
- ☐ Not an ALC

Measure: 6.1

Students will show proficiency in performance of core skills performed in their internship when 70% or more score Outstanding or Very Good. Assessments relating to student performance of core skills will be completed by professionals who supervise interns.

Result:

Accurate and thorough data reporting means: a. Report data for all students or other constituents; b. Report data that matches data requirements established by a measure (i.e., your assessment must measure what you set out to measure); c. Report granular and aggregate results (e.g.,

subscale and total scores from a rubric or exam); d. Response rates are provided for survey data; e. The underlying "n" and "N" are provided for all percentage statistics and if a change score is provided the data points to support the score are included; f. Representative samples should include data from students at a distance (regional campuses or online/video) if courses are offered at these locations/through these modalities.

- ☒ Target met
- ☐ Target not met

Internship sponsors rated the proficiency of their interns (response number may vary as some skills may not have been required) with results in the following categories: Associated Press Style, N=102: 40 Outstanding, 62 Very Good, 0 Needs Improvement, 0 Unsatisfactory, 100% scored Outstanding or Very Good. Writing Skills: N=106, 52 Outstanding, 52 Very Good, 2 Needs Improvement, 0 Unsatisfactory, 104 out of 106 (98%) were rated Outstanding or Very Good in their writing. Research Skills: N=109, 68 Outstanding, 40 Very Good, 1 Needs Improvement, ~~1 Needs Improvement~~ 0 Unsatisfactory, 108 out of 109 (99%) were rated Very Good or Outstanding in research skills. Time Management Skills: N= 109, 60 Outstanding, 42 Very Good, 4 Needs Improvement, 3 Unsatisfactory, 100 out of 109 (93.5%) were rated Very Good or Outstanding in time management skills. Teamwork: N = 109, 84 Outstanding, 24 Very Good, 1 Needs Improvement, 0 Unsatisfactory, 108 out of 109 (99%) were rated Very Good or Outstanding in teamwork ability. AP Writing style increased from 99% last year to 100% this year, writing skills increased from 97% last year to 98% this year, research skills increased from 96% last year to 99% this year, time management skills increased from 91% last year to 93% this year, and teamwork ability increased from 98% last year to 99% this year. We are pleased that the percentage of students rated Outstanding or Very Good increased in all categories.

Did your results show an improvement compared to previous year(s) results?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

If yes, describe the improvement by giving a comparison with previous year's results. If no, please explain:

All areas show improvement over last year.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 6.2

Students will have gained experience in the major and profession's core skills or research, writing, planning, and team work while interning. Students will complete a survey at the completion of their internship experience, and 90% or more will indicate the experience was valuable to their education and professional development.

Result:

Accurate and thorough data reporting means: a. Report data for all students or other constituents; b. Report data that matches data requirements established by a measure (i.e., your assessment must measure what you set out to measure); c. Report granular and aggregate results (e.g., subscale and total scores from a rubric or exam); d. Response rates are provided for survey data; e. The underlying "n" and "N" are provided for all percentage statistics and if a change score is provided the data points to support the score are included; f. Representative samples should include data from students at a distance (regional campuses or online/video) if courses are offered at these locations/through these modalities.

- ☒ Target met

☐ Target not met

N = 101 99 out of 101 responded "yes" and 2 out of 101 responded "no." 98% said that the internship experience was valuable to their education and professional development.

Did your results show an improvement compared to previous year(s) results?

☐ Yes

☒ No

If yes, describe the improvement by giving a comparison with previous year's results. If no, please explain:

The results (98%) remained the same as last year.

Review:

☐ Revision or explanation needed

☒ Satisfactory

Reflective Statement:

Analyze and discuss your results by: a. Why do you think you got the results that you did; b. If you saw improvement from last year, explain exactly what improved and how do you know that it is an improvement (give prior year's results and this year's results to demonstrate the change). Verify that the improvement was a consequence of a strategy or change implemented in prior year(s); and c. Provide an improvement plan, if required (e.g., Discuss additional student learning or operational changes you will implement in response to these results).

These surveys from intern supervisors are the most important data faculty have in determining the effectiveness of our courses. Some semesters, we are actually surprised the averages are as high as they are, because in the classroom, students don't seem as dedicated to quality. But that means they are trying in the workplace, and that is the most important thing.

Reflective Statement Review:

☐ Revision or explanation needed

☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

The success rate is very high, and the program should be commended on this measure. DG

- Zack's notes 11/4/15
- 6.1 - I like the granular/disaggregate data giving us the scores for all the various areas being evaluated. I would like to see an overall scores as well though.
 - In the comparison to last year's data section... tell us last year's numbers. How much improvement was there? What caused the improvement? Was it something the program did to improve students' core skills? This could all be evidence for "closing the loop".
- 6.2 - Is there any granular data that this survey can provide to help the program determine what areas might need improvement. Is there a particular area/aspect of their internship that students felt they weren't as prepared for or didn't get as much from? This sort of analytical data could be provided by comments or further questions on the survey. Just something to consider to help the program collect more useful data.

The revision includes overall scores. DG 12/1/15

Attachments: Measure 6.1 Spring 2014.docx Measure 6.2.docx

Outcome: 7

Students will demonstrate an understanding of the history and role of professionals and institutions in shaping communication.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

- ☐ Communication
- ☒ Critical Thinking
- ☒ Discipline-specific knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors
- ☐ Not an ALC

Measure: 7.1

Students in PUR 4801 (PR Case Studies) will demonstrate in presentations an understanding of the individuals and institutions who have had successes and failures in communication programs. A rubric with a 5-point scale will be completed by the instructor. 70% of students will score a 3.0 or higher.

Result:

Accurate and thorough data reporting means: a. Report data for all students or other constituents; b. Report data that matches data requirements established by a measure (i.e., your assessment must measure what you set out to measure); c. Report granular and aggregate results (e.g., subscale and total scores from a rubric or exam); d. Response rates are provided for survey data; e. The underlying "n" and "N" are provided for all percentage statistics and if a change score is provided the data points to support the score are included; f. Representative samples should include data from students at a distance (regional campuses or online/video) if courses are offered at these locations/through these modalities.

- ☒ Target met
- ☐ Target not met

Due to faculty departures, there is no data for this measure. We are gathering it this term for next year's assessment.

Did your results show an improvement compared to previous year(s) results?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

If yes, describe the improvement by giving a comparison with previous year's results. If no, please explain:

We have no data to compare.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 7.2

75% of students in ADV 3008 (Principles of Advertising) and PUR 4000 (Introduction to Public Relations) will be able to identify key individuals and institutions relevant to each field. A pre-test with multiple choice answers on institutions and individuals that will be covered in the course will be given. On Test 1, the same, or very similar questions, will be asked as a post-test. 75% of students will answer the questions correctly.

Result:

Accurate and thorough data reporting means: a. Report data for all students or other constituents; b. Report data that matches data requirements established by a measure (i.e., your assessment must measure what you set out to measure); c. Report granular and aggregate results (e.g., subscale and total scores from a rubric or exam); d. Response rates are provided for survey data; e. The underlying "n" and "N" are provided for all percentage statistics and if a change score is provided the data points to support the score are included; f. Representative samples should include data from students at a distance (regional campuses or online/video) if courses are offered at these locations/through these modalities.

- ☒ Target met
- ☐ Target not met

PUR 4000 N = 206 on pre-test, 14% correct on Q1, 26% correct on Q2, 84% correct on Q3. N = 206 on post-test 72% correct in Q1, 71% correct on Q2, 99% correct on Q3. ADV 3008 N= 284 on pre-test, 14% correct on Q1, 21% correct on Q2, Post-test (questions randomly generated in an online exam, so N varies per question) Q 1 (N = 33) 72% correct, Q 2 (N = 29) 86% correct. The target was met for some questions in both classes, but not met in others. However, the percentages are close in PUR 4000, so the faculty does not feel this triggers a need to change pedagogy. In ADV 3008, the sample size for the post-test is small due to the exams being online, the question bank being so huge, and around 10% of the students getting the question. With a different class sample, it is reasonable to assume the result could have been different.

Did your results show an improvement compared to previous year(s) results?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

If yes, describe the improvement by giving a comparison with previous year's results. If no, please explain:

The results are fairly close to last year.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Reflective Statement:

Analyze and discuss your results by: a. Why do you think you got the results that you did; b. If you saw improvement from last year, explain exactly what improved and how do you know that it is an improvement (give prior year's results and this year's results to demonstrate the change). Verify that the improvement was a consequence of a strategy or change implemented in prior year(s); and c. Provide an improvement plan, if required (e.g., Discuss additional student learning or operational changes you will implement in response to these results).

This outcome was inspired by the criteria of our accrediting body, the Association of Educators in Journalism and Mass Communication. Several years ago, we were pursuing accreditation and we wanted the data. Over the seven or so years we have gathered the results, it has not changed significantly. Next year, we will most likely replace this outcome with something new in an effort to find other areas of need and improvement.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Again, further data collection is needed for measure 7.1. The program recognizes this shortcoming and is moving to remedy this problem. DG

- Zack's notes 11/4/15
- 7.1 again concerning that another measure has no data, but it seems like the program is taking steps to prevent that in the future.
- 7.2 If target was met for some questions and not others I would be inclined to check "target not met"... I might recommend changing the target for future assessments to remedy this. Pick a target that will allow you to aggregate an overall score to use as the benchmark to make it clearer. You can still report the disaggregate data of the % correct for each question. That data is very useful. Perhaps reporting the overall mean would be a better suited target.

Attachments: Measure 7.2 Results PUR4000.docx 7.2 PUR4000Pre&PostTest Sp 14.docx

Top

Outcome: 8

Students will demonstrate strategic application of research and creative skills that are tied to message points in projects.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

- ☒ Communication
- ☒ Critical Thinking
- ☒ Discipline-specific knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors
- ☐ Not an ALC

Measure: 8.1

70% of students in ADV 4101 (Advertising Copywriting) and MMC 4411 (Ad/PR Campaigns) will strategically apply research and creative skills for message development in course projects. Faculty observation in both courses will be used to complete rubrics.

Result:

Accurate and thorough data reporting means: a. Report data for all students or other constituents; b. Report data that matches data requirements established by a measure (i.e., your assessment must measure what you set out to measure); c. Report granular and aggregate results (e.g., subscale and total scores from a rubric or exam); d. Response rates are provided for survey data; e. The underlying "n" and "N" are provided for all percentage statistics and if a change score is provided the data points to support the score are included; f. Representative samples should include data from students at a distance (regional campuses or online/video) if courses are offered at these locations/through these modalities.

- ☒ Target met
- ☐ Target not met

Using a scale where 1 = strategy developed out of research present 2 = +clearly articulated 3 = +visually enhanced 4 = +clear objectives 5 = +high degree of quality. ADV 4101: Advertising Copywriting (Faculty Observation) N = 5 projects, 20 students (4 students in each group), 2 out of 5 rated 5, 3 out of 5 rated 4, 1 out of 5 rated 3, 0 out of 5 rated 2, 0 out of 5 rated 1, Total: 5 out of 5 (100%) rated 3.0 or higher. MMC 4411: Ad/PR Campaigns (Faculty Observation) N = 5 projects, 20 students (4 students in each group), 2 out of 5 rated 5, 2 out of 5 rated 4, 1 out of 5 rated 3, 1 out of 5 rated 2, 0 out of 5 rated 1, Total: 4 out of 5 (80%) rated 3.0 or higher Combining both courses, the measure was met, as 91% of the project books scored 3.0 or higher. Last year in ADV 4101, 2 groups out of 4 rated 5, 1 out of 4 rated 4, 1 out of 4 rated 3, therefore the results were the same for both years.

Did your results show an improvement compared to previous year(s) results?

- ☐ Yes
☒ No

If yes, describe the improvement by giving a comparison with previous year's results. If no, please explain:

The results are similar to last year for ADV 4101. There was no data last year in MMC 4411 to compare.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 8.2

70% of students in ADV 4101 (Advertising Copywriting) and MMC 4411 (Ad/PR Campaigns) will demonstrate strategic application of research and creative skills that are tied to message points in class projects. A panel of professionals will review a representative sample of projects from each class and fill out rubrics. Rubrics will be developed (revised and enhanced from existing--and admittedly weak--rubrics) before the academic year begins and attached on next year's assessment. 80% of students will score a 4.0 or higher on a 5-point scale.

Result:

Accurate and thorough data reporting means: a. Report data for all students or other constituents; b. Report data that matches data requirements established by a measure (i.e., your assessment must measure what you set out to measure); c. Report granular and aggregate results (e.g., subscale and total scores from a rubric or exam); d. Response rates are provided for survey data; e. The underlying "n" and "N" are provided for all percentage statistics and if a change score is provided the data points to support the score are included; f. Representative samples should include data from students at a distance (regional campuses or online/video) if courses are offered at these locations/through these modalities.

- ☒ Target met
☐ Target not met

SCALE 1 = strategy developed out of research present, 2 = +clearly articulated, 3 = +visually enhanced, 4 = +clear objectives, 5 = +high degree of quality. ADV 4101: Advertising Copywriting (Faculty Observation) N = 5 projects, 20 students (4 students in each group), 3 out of 6 rated 5, 2 out of 5 rated 4, 0 out of 5 rated 3, 0 out of 5 rated 2, 0 out of 5 rated 1, Total: 5 out of 5 (100%) rated 3.0 or higher. MMC 4411: Ad/PR Campaigns (Faculty Observation) N = 5 projects, 20 students (4 students in each group), 3 out of 5 rated 5, 1 out of 5 rated 4, 1 out of 5 rated 3, 0 out of 5 rated 2, 0 out of 5 rated 1, Total: 5 out of 5 (100%) rated 3.0 or higher. Combining both courses, the measure was met, as 100% of the project books scored 3.0 or higher. Last year 2 groups out of 4 rated a 5, and 2 groups out of 4 rated a 4.

Did your results show an improvement compared to previous year(s) results?

- ☐ Yes
☒ No

If yes, describe the improvement by giving a comparison with previous year's results. If no, please explain:

The results were similar to last year.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Reflective Statement:

Analyze and discuss your results by: a. Why do you think you got the results that you did; b. If you saw improvement from last year, explain exactly what improved and how do you know that it is an improvement (give prior year's results and this year's results to demonstrate the change). Verify that the improvement was a consequence of a strategy or change implemented in prior year(s); and c. Provide an improvement plan, if required (e.g., Discuss additional student learning or operational changes you will implement in response to these results).

Industry professionals are consistently impressed with the calibre our students do in the capstone course. Faculty judge the books slightly more rigorously than professionals, but faculty also know the level of feedback and coaching that went into getting the students to that point. Because there is so much research in the projects, especially in MMC 4411, the professionals comment positively, often saying the students did more research then their staff gets to perform. We are pleased with the professionals' feedback, as ultimately they hire our students based on what they do in our courses.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

The program appears to meet the standards in place for Outcome 8. DG

- Zack's notes 11/4/15
- 8.1 - Same as 3.1 is this a group project? is that how we get 6 projects from 24 students? or is 6 a sample from the 24? Perhaps this could be clarified.
 - If there are 6 projects why is the data being reported as "3 out of 5 rated 5"? Shouldn't it be 3 out of 6? or maybe it should say 5 projects instead of 6?
- 8.2 - Okay 8.2 seems to indicate that there is a sample, but it still leaves me confused.... Is it a sample of 6 projects from 24 student projects? Again the data reported here says "3 out of 5 rated 5" etc. Is it a sample of 5 out of 6 projects? I could use some clarification here too.

Clarification provided in the revision. DG 12/1/15

Attachments: Measure 8.1 Results.docx Measure 8.2 Results.docx

Mentoring - Coordinator

1. In what ways did you interact and receive feedback from your assigned IE Assessment Divisional Review Committee (DRC) reviewer(s) and DRC Chair? (Check all that apply)

- ☐ Email
- ☐ Phone
- ☐ Meetings
- ☐ From the DRC Review in the IE Assessment Web Application
- ☐ I received communication, but was not able to connect with my mentor(s)
- ☒ None prior to the first submission of the results report to the DRC for review
- ☐ Other (Please specify)

2. Choose the statement below that best describes how you used the feedback from your assigned IE Assessment Divisional Review Committee reviewer(s) or DRC Chair.

- ☐ Feedback helped to improve this results report
- ☐ Feedback did not result in improvements to this results report
- ☒ Feedback will help to improve a future plan
- ☐ The results report is being submitted to the DRC for initial review
- ☐ Other (Please specify)

Mentoring - DRC Chair and Reviewer(s)

1. In what ways did you interact and provide feedback to the coordinator(s), faculty or staff member(s) involved with this IE Assessment results report. (Check all that apply)

- ☐ Email
- ☐ Phone
- ☐ Meetings
- ☐ From the DRC Review in the IE Assessment Web Application
- ☐ I attempted contact, but was not able to connect with the assessment coordinator(s)
- ☒ None prior to the initial submission of the results report to the DRC for review
- ☐ Other (Please specify)

2. Choose the statement below that best describes how the coordinator(s), faculty or staff members involved with this IE Assessment results report used the feedback.

- ☒ Feedback helped to improve this results report
- ☐ Feedback did not result in improvements to this results report
- ☐ Feedback will help to improve a future plan
- ☐ The results report was submitted to the DRC for initial review
- ☐ Other (Please specify)

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:

Portfolios from the capstone course are used for faculty-completed rubrics and professional panel review
 Capstone projects are used for faculty completed rubrics and professional review
 Pre-test and post-test questions are used in ADV 3008: Principles of Advertising, PUR 4000: Introduction to Public Relations, and MMC 3630: Social Media as Mass Communication

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Review Comments:

I would suggest surveys to alumni to assess their perceptions of their academic programs as they relate to their occupational experiences. DG

- Zack's notes 11/5/15
- You identify a lot of assessment instruments but I think there are a few that were missed.
- Under examinations I would have checked "pre-post test", "post-test only", and "other" as these items are used

Assessment rubrics are used in ADV 4101: Advertising Copywriting; PUR 3100: Writing for PR, and MMC 4411: Ad/PR Campaigns

Examinations/Tests:**Standardized:**

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

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

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

Explain EACH item checked above:

Pre-test and post-test questions are used in ADV 3008: Principles of Advertising, PUR 4000: Introduction to Public Relations, and MMC 3630: Social Media as Mass Communication

Surveys:**Institution (UCF):**

- ☐ UCF Graduating Student Survey (Seniors or Graduate student)
- ☐ Alumni Survey
- ☐ Student Satisfaction Survey
- ☐ First Destination Survey
- ☐ Employee Survey
- ☐ Entering Student 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:**Other Survey(s):**

- ☐ National Survey
- ☐ State Survey

in some of your measures.

- Perhaps also under surveys I might check "other" to identify the peer evaluation that students do regarding teamwork. It should be identified somewhere in this section and that may be the best category for it.
- Lastly, You do a good job of explaining what assessment instruments are used and what courses they are used in. I would also like to see here which measures they are tied too.

☒ Other Survey

Explain EACH item checked above:

Miscellaneous Assessment Methods:

- ☒ Advisory Board
☐ Focus Group
☐ Institutional Data
☐ Student Records
☐ Accreditation Reviews (e.e. SACS, CAEP, ABET)
☐ Other

Explain EACH item checked above:

Changes to Academic Process:

- ☐ Modify Frequency or Schedule of Course Offerings
☐ Make Technology Related Improvements
☒ Make Personnel Related Changes

Is this an implemented or planned change?

- ☒ Implemented Change
☐ Planned Change
☐ Both

Implemented change in current assessment cycle:

The information you see below has been taken from your own plan and results for the current assessment cycle. This means you must complete the results and reflective statement in the previous tab before you go on to edit and complete the section below.

Strategy - Intentional actions that bring about change. How did you bring about a change?

Outcome: 4 Measure: 1

Explain the strategy that you implemented to bring about the change:

We were unable to collect data for this measure as we had more adjunct faculty than usual that we were unable to get data from.

Describe the data that you collected to assess the change:

All five sections of this essential skills course were taught by adjuncts last term. We have no data to report for this measure.

Describe Improvement(s):

(If baseline data or no improvement, please explain next steps)

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:

It would appear that some of the changes to "Academic Process" involve putting more tenure track/tenured faculty in some of the courses. That is, replacing adjuncts who were reported as lacking in rigor in certain courses (however defined). DG

- Zack's notes 11/5/15
- No changes are identified here. I think this can be revised.
- You can talk about past changes in this section as well as planned new changes.
- In a few places throughout the plan you talk about things like adjusting rubrics

PUR 3100: Writing for PR is the most crucial course in our curriculum--this is agreed upon by faculty and the professional community whom hire our graduates. We have hired a new faculty member who has embraced the need for assessment data. He is also looking at new ways to measure the outcomes. We are very eager to see what next year's assessment shows us for this crucial course.

- ☐ Implement Additional Training
- ☐ Revise Advising Standards or Process
- ☐ Revise Admission Criteria
- ☐ Other implemented or planned change
- ☐ No Changes to Academic Process

Changes to Curriculum:

- ☒ Revise and/or Enforce Prerequisites

Is this an implemented or planned change?

- ☐ Implemented Change
- ☒ Planned Change
- ☐ Both

Planned change for next assessment cycle:

The information you see below has been taken from your own plan and results for the current assessment cycle. This means you must complete the results and reflective statement in the previous tab before you go on to edit and complete the section below.

Strategy - Intentional actions that bring about change. How are you going to bring about a change?

Outcome: 3 Measure: 2

Explain the strategy that you will implement to attempt to bring about the change:

Our assessment of student's performance in this course, has led ~~Having made~~ to changes to MMC 3420: Mass Media Research Methods for the first time in eight years. We are eager to see next year's data. This course is not a favorite among students, but it is a vital part of their career foundation. This will be an area of emphasis with regard to assessment. The curriculum will have more of an emphasis on applied research applications rather than on only theory and will only be open to majors.

Describe the data that you will collect to assess the change to provide evidence of improvement:

A change in faculty between last academic year and this academic year resulted in no data being collected for this measure. This past year a greater emphasis was placed on research skills. The course was overhauled and is being delivered differently, so the results would not have been extremely relevant or useful. We have submitted curriculum changes for the 2016-2017 catalog year for the prerequisite to be changed to Mass Communication majors and minors. The course will focus on applied research, in addition to theory to align more with the research skill students/graduates will need in their internships and their careers. We are collecting data this academic year to report in next year's assessment. We did notice an

and getting all faculty/professional evaluators on the same page for rubric interpretation. These things might be considered changes to the assessment plan or data collection process. And can be discussed here.

- You also state in several places that you are considering removing/changing outcomes and measures. These definitely qualify as changes to the assessment plan. Even if you don't know all the details yet you can discuss things that the program is considering.
- All the changes that the program is making to make sure that all the necessary data will be collected in the future can also count as changes.
- Comparisons to last years data is a little lacking. From the comments/explanations there seems to have been little or no significant improvements over last years data that could have been the result of previous change. Even if no improvement has resulted so far you may consider still discussing past changes especially if those changes may potentially lead to improvement in a later cycle.

Changes to the curriculum should allow you to assess changes in the future. DG 12/1/15

increase in student performance on 3.1 data which may also be as a result of the changes to this course as they begin to be implemented.

- ☐ Revise Course Sequence
- ☐ Revise Course Content
- ☐ Add Course
- ☐ Delete Course
- ☐ Other implemented or planned change
- ☐ No Changes to Curriculum

Changes to Assessment Plan:

- ☐ Revise Student Outcome Statement
- ☒ Revise Measurement Approach

This selection can only be a planned change

- ☒ Planned Change

Planned change for next assessment cycle:

The information you see below has been taken from your own plan and results for the current assessment cycle. This means you must complete the results and reflective statement in the previous tab before you go on to edit and complete the section below.

Strategy - Intentional actions that bring about change. How are you going to bring about a change?

Outcome: 1 Measure: 1

Explain the strategy that you will implement to attempt to bring about the change:

Discussions with the faculty have indicated that perhaps the interpretations of the rubric may vary between the faculty and professionals. Perhaps we can more clearly identify for both groups the criteria. We may also need to clarify expectations to the students as well. ~~We also have a new faculty member who will replace the adjunct with low rigor standards in ADV 4101.~~ As we realized we did have a granular data as an attachment in last year's results, we were able to look more closely at the granular data. In analyzing past and current assessment data for this outcome we believe we need to make changes to the rubric. The rubric rating scale increased by one was: ideas were presented, visuals enhanced, point clearly articulated, objectives stated and met, high degree of quality, were present in the books. However, only the highest rating referenced the quality. Perhaps, this caused some ambiguity in interpretation for the reviewer's and/or faculty members. During the next cycle we will make changes to the rubric to better assess the students' work. We will also be sure expectations are made clear to the students as well. We are also working on improving data collection; hopefully we will have less turnover of faculty this year and have met to discuss the data that will need to be collected in the next cycle.

Describe the data that you will collect to assess the change to provide evidence of improvement:

Unfortunately PUR 3100 this past year was taught by adjuncts and the data was not collected. In ADV 4101 Advertising Copywriting: N=10 groups, 2 out of 10 rated 5; 3 out of 10 rated 4; 3 out of 10 rated 3; 2 out of 10 rated 2; 0 rated 1; total 80% (8 out of 10)

earned a 3.0 or higher. In MMC 4411 Ad/PR Campaigns: N = 7 groups, 1 out of 7 rated 5; 4 out of 7 rated 4; 2 out of 7 rated 3; 0 rated 2 or 1; total 100% (7 out of 7) earned a 3.0 or higher. Therefore, overall 88.2% (15 out of 17) earned 3.0 or higher on presenting their proposals, plans and strategies by faculty observation. The target was met, however last year ADV 4101 N=8 and 100% met the target. We believe the decrease this year in ADV 4101 is due largely to a new interpretation of the rubric. A committee of instructors met after last year's assessment results to create agreement on how assess the work and comply with the rubric. However, adjunct faculty were not available for the discussions on assessing work and use of the rubric, which may have accounted for this year's decrease. This reinforces the need to be sure all faculty are applying the same standards and interpretation of the rubric. We are pleased the senior level students in MMC 4411 achieved 100%, especially since data for this course was not available last year.

- ☐ Collect and Analyze Additional Data and Information
- ☐ Change Method of Data Collection
- ☐ Other implemented or planned change(s)
- ☐ Plan has been reviewed and no changes made
- ☒ No Changes to Assessment Plan

If 'No Changes' indicated, please provide an explanation, including a strategy to improve IE assessment data collection to yield useful information.

Our strategy to improve IE assessment data is still being formed by faculty. We will submit it by the deadline when we complete next year's plan.

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)
 ☒ Maturing (3)
 ☐ Accomplished (4)
 ☐ Exemplary (5)

Indicators:

- ☒ 1. Complete and relevant data are provided for all measures and an explanation is provided for how representative samples are determined, if applicable. If data are incomplete or missing, provide an explanation of the extenuating circumstances.

Justification for incomplete or missing data due to extenuating circumstances will not be permitted for two or more consecutive reports. Representative samples should include data from students at a distance (regional campuses or online/video) if courses are offered at these locations/through these modalities.

- ☒ 2. Data reporting is accurate and thorough (see supporting narrative)

Accurate and thorough data reporting means:

- Reported data match data requirements established by a measure.
- Sampling methodology and response rates are provided for survey data.
- The underlying "n" and "N" are provided for all percentage statistics.


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

This may be done explicitly (e.g., "target met" or "target not met") or implicitly (i.e., the reported data clearly indicate whether the target was or was not met).

- ☒ 4. Reflective statements are provided either for each outcome or aggregated for multiple outcomes. Whether individual or aggregated reflective statements are provided, all outcomes must be addressed.

- ☒ 5. Report includes one or more implemented and/or planned changes linked to assessment data

and designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit operations. If no such changes are indicated, an explanation is provided including a strategy to improve IE assessment data collection. Implemented and planned changes designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance may be referenced in reflective statements, but should be thoroughly documented in the implemented and planned changes section of this report. NOTE: the IE Assessment Plan should be revised to include one or more measures to assess the impact/effectiveness of such changes. If no such changes are reported, the IE Assessment Plan itself should be carefully reviewed and revised as needed. Implemented or planned changes that are based on factors other than IE assessment data may be reported in the summary statement of the results report. New measures may also be established in the plan to evaluate the impact of those changes as well, regardless of the reason for the change.

 6. Assessment instruments associated with the report and not previously submitted with the plan are provided via attachment or URL if not proprietary. Copies of assessment instruments should normally have been submitted with the plan during the prior IE Assessment cycle. If that previously submitted plan identified an instrument in development or if another new assessment instrument was developed and used in association with the current results report, that instrument should be attached to this report.

Additional Indicators:

- ☐ 7. Data collection and analysis are used to assess the impact of implemented changes, demonstrating a fully "closed loop" process. When an outcome and/or measure(s) evaluates the impact of a previously reported change, the reflective statement for that outcome should include a determination of whether the change resulted in an improvement.
- ☐ 8. Follow-up data collected to assess the impact of implemented changes show improved outcomes. Meeting this final criterion for one or more measures is the ultimate goal of IE Assessment. When data confirm improvement(s) in student learning outcomes, program quality, or unit operations, the improvement(s) should be well documented in the applicable reflective statement(s). In addition, the Summary of Assessment Process should provide a brief narrative that describes the entire "closed loop" process that resulted in the improvement(s).

Summary of Quality Improvements:

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).

The majority of our outcomes we have used for many years--some five years or longer. We had good reasons for this, namely our pursuit of accreditation. Even when we stopped pursuing accreditation, we felt the guidelines were good ones, and used them as the basis of our program assessments. Next year we want to experiment with evaluating other program-specific outcomes in the hopes of learning where we can improve our curriculum.

We unexpectedly lost two senior faculty members and unfortunately did not get data we needed. We now have new full-time senior faculty members in place and have discussed the need for better data collection this next year.

Review Criteria:

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

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Review:

A number of measures require additional data collection. The program clearly indicated that data collection is part of their plans. DG

- Zack's notes 11/5/15
- Overall a lot of this report is great. Results are reported well. Disaggregate/granular data is reported. There is some analysis of the results and discussion of possible changes. The reporting is succinct and includes most necessary information.
- However there are several places that I would like to see some revision or clarification and a few suggestions for future results reports.

- Mainly if the comments for measure 3.1 and the "implemented and planned changes" sections are addressed we can change the rating of the report.
 - For all measures in the "Did you results show improvement..." sections I would like to see more thorough comparisons. Tell us what last years numbers were. If there was improvement or decline (no matter how small) what may have accounted for the difference?
 - 6.1 especially all it says is "all areas improved from last year" How much did they improve? what caused the improvement?
 - I understand that in some of your measures you are at or near 100% and have been for a number of years so not much can be made of comparisons there.
 - 2.1 I'd like to see the scores for each area of the evaluation and the evaluation form should be attached.
 - 3.1 some data seems to be missing. Also please clarify the sample.
 - 8.1 and 8.2 sample clarification also.