

# UCF Assessment

## Assessment Plan and Results

Plan Year:  Status: Results Approved for DRC Report  
 Program/Unit:  Last Updated: 11/16/2016 12:12:48 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  2014-2015 Results Review

Program/Unit:	Advertising/Public Relations - B.A.	DRC:	College of Sciences
Year:	2015-2016	DRC Chair:	Elizabeth Grauerholz
Due Date:		Coordinator(s):	Kim Tuorto, Boyd Lindsley, Joan McCain
		Reviewer(s):	Amy Donley

### Quick Links:

#### Mission:

The Advertising-Public Relations program is committed to serving its stakeholders who are comprised of students, alumni, the professional community and the Central Florida community. The mission of the program is to prepare students for careers in the widely diverse fields of advertising and public relations by providing a high-quality education to students in core values, ethics and the concepts, strategies, and techniques of strategic communication; and promote student engagement that influences real-world experience through internships, partnerships and community involvement.

#### Assessment Process:

Ad-PR program 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 College Educators in Journalism and Mass Communication (ACEJMC). The plan includes direct and indirect measures for mastery of skills, understanding of concepts, critical analysis, and effective teamwork practices. The direct measures are accomplished by faculty implementation of pre- and post-test in lecture classes (Dr. Timothy Sellnow in PUR 4400, Drs. Dodd and Rubenking in MMC 3420), faculty observation of student performance (Ms. Joan McCain, Dr. Melissa Dodd, Ms. Lindsay Hudock, and Mr. Gary LaPage) in ADV 4101, MMC 4411, and PUR 4801; and completion of rubrics in skills courses, (Ms. Joan McCain, Ms. Lindsay Hudock, Dr. Melissa Dodd, Mr. Gary LaPage, and Mr. Doug Blemker) in ADV 4101, 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). Results of the data collected will be discussed and analyzed with the Ad-PR faculty to

continuously strive to improve the program. The Ad-PR program presents its assessment (results and intentions for the next plan) to the NSC faculty and staff annually at the faculty workday in August.

### Relationship to Strategic Plan:

Outcomes one through five all strive toward both the program and the University's strategic initiative to provide undergraduate excellence through an educated citizenry that focuses on the core knowledge, analytical and application abilities, values, ethics and oral and written communication skills graduates will need to be successful in their careers. Outcomes six through eight relate to community impact and professional excellence through our partnerships with local employers and professional organizations in the local, national and global community.

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 in the major's capstone course MMC 4411: Advertising Campaigns will complete their final group project assignment and will demonstrate their ability to satisfactorily present proposals, plans, and strategies at a professional-readiness level. Student work will be evaluated by faculty observation utilizing the following 5-point scale (1= ideas were satisfactorily presented; 2= ideas were satisfactorily presented and visually enhanced; 3= ideas were satisfactorily presented, visually enhanced, and point clearly articulated; 4= ideas were satisfactorily presented, visually enhanced, point clearly articulated, objectives were stated and met; 5= ideas were satisfactorily presented, visually enhanced, point clearly articulated, objectives were stated and met with a high degree of quality). A minimum of 75% the projects 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

Students in MMC 4411: Advertising Campaigns were evaluated on their final group project by faculty observation using the above 5 point scale. N = 83 students, 9 out of 83 (11%) rated 5; 23 out of 83 (28%) rated 4; 40 out of 83 (48%) rated 3; 11 out of 83 (13%) rated 2; 0 rated 1. Therefore, the target was met as 87% (72 out of 83) earned 3.0 or higher on presenting their proposals, plans and strategies by faculty observation.

### 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:**

Last year in MMC 4411 100% scored 3.0 or higher on their abilities to present proposals, plans and strategies compared to 87% this year. This year results are more consistent as we evaluated this learning outcome in only the capstone course and it was taught by the same instructor both semesters and the decrease this year may have been a result of increased rigor.

**Review:**

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

**Measure: 1.2**

Students in the major's capstone course MMC 4411: Advertising Campaigns will complete their final group project assignment and will demonstrate their ability to satisfactorily present proposals, plans, and strategies at a professional-readiness level. Student work will be evaluated by an industry panel utilizing the following 5-point scale (1= ideas were satisfactorily presented; 2= ideas were satisfactorily presented and visually enhanced; 3= ideas were satisfactorily presented, visually enhanced, and point clearly articulated; 4= ideas were satisfactorily presented, visually enhanced, point clearly articulated, objectives were stated and met; 5= ideas were satisfactorily presented, visually enhanced, point clearly articulated, objectives were stated and met with a high degree of quality). A minimum of 75% of the campaign books (final projects) 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

Students in the major's capstone course MMC 4411: Advertising Campaigns completed their final group project assignment and were evaluated on their ability to satisfactorily present proposals, plans, and strategies at a professional-readiness level by an industry panel utilizing the following the 5-point scale above (5 being the highest). Students worked in groups, five students per group each semester. In the spring N= 5 projects (25 students); 1 group was rated 5, 3 groups were rated 4, 1 group was rated 3, 0 were rated 2 or below. In the fall semester N=3 projects (15 students); 1 group was rated 5, 1 group was rated 4, 1 group was rated 3, 0 were rated 2 or below. Totals for the year N=8; 2 groups were rated 5, 4 groups were rated 4, 2 groups were rated 3, 0 were rated 2 or below. The target was met as 100% of the group projects were rated 3 or higher.

**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:**

Last year we had set the rating to be 4; two groups in MMC 4411 had only achieved a rating of 3.0.

If we compare both last year and this year with a score of 3.0 or better, the results for both year's would be the same 100%.

### 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).

Last year we had quite a bit of inconsistency and variables in measuring this learning outcome. For example, we were looking at multiple courses and also measure 1.1 the target was a 3.0 and a 4.0 for measure 1.2. After analyzing the results last year, it was determined in order to be able for this learning outcome to be effective for assessment, we needed to eliminate the variables and inconsistencies. In this year's plan we made both targets for the measure be a 3.0 as we also limited the learning outcome to one course, MMC 4411 capstone class. The faculty also discussed academic rigor and interpretations of the rubrics, expectations were made more clear between faculty and students. The faculty member also met one-to-one with the groups to be sure they better understood the expected criteria and learning outcomes for the final projects and the course.

### Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

### Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

The changes that were made have made for clear measures in assessing this outcome. As this has recently been changed I recommend continuing with this measure going forward to be able able to assess possible improvement in the future. As you easily exceeded both goals (minimum of 75% will earn a 3 or higher), consider increasing the goal. - AD 10/1

- Zack's notes 11/14/16
- Measure 1.1: Looks pretty good. Good job including the disaggregate data of how many students scored at each level of the rubric. Good job explaining what may have led to the decline in scores. The only thing I think might be useful to the program and interesting for us to see in the assessment report is some deeper analysis of the results. 11% scored a 5, meaning 89% of students missed something. Was there a particular area(s) of the assignment that students struggled with? Is there something the program could do to help students improve in that area?
- Measure 1.2: Looks pretty good. Same comments as for 1.1.
- Reflective statement: Good. Nice job explaining the process of eliminating variables and inconsistencies. Good discussion of the faculty talking about consistency with the rubrics, and that faculty met with the student groups to make sure expectations were clear.
- **Questions and Suggestions:**
  - Is the assignment in 1.1 and 1.2 the same assignment? This is what I originally thought, in both measures the assignment is described as the final group project in MMC 4411. But I'm now confused because the N in 1.1 is 83 while the number of students listed in 1.2 is 40. Can you explain why the number of students is not the same please?
  - I like the idea of the same assignment being judged by both faculty and industry professionals, but if this is the case then my comments above about providing some deeper analysis go double. What is the evaluation by the industry professionals telling the program that the evaluation by faculty is not? Are there any particular areas of the rubric

that the faculty think students are doing okay with but the industry professionals disagree, or vice versa? Or are there any areas that both sets of judges agree needs more work? These are questions that may provide the program with valuable information to help you with improving student abilities and knowledge.

- I agree with the reviewer, this is the second year in a row that the targets have been easily met. If this trend continues you may want to consider raising the bar and/or considering other areas to assess.

**Attachments:** Measure 1.1 Sp15-Fa15.docx Measure1.2 Sp15-Fa-15.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 in the major's capstone course MMC 4411: Advertising Campaigns will complete their final group project assignment and will demonstrate their ability to satisfactorily work as a team. The groups usually consist of four students working together from beginning to end on an advertising campaign. Upon completion of the project each member will complete a peer evaluation form for each of their team members using a 10 point system. Students will be rated on each category: professional behavior (1 point), punctual and consistent meeting attendance (2 points), collaborative participation (3 points), responsiveness to emails, calls and texts (3 points), timely submission of materials (3 points). It is expected that 90% of the students will receive 7 points or higher out of the 10 points possible.

### 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 in the major's capstone course MMC 4411: Advertising Campaigns completed their final group project assignment, each member completed a peer evaluation form for each of their team members using a 10 point system. Students were rated on each category: N= 83 students (45 in spring, 38 in fall); 83 out of 83 (100%) students scored 1 point for professional behavior; students' scored 160 out of 166 (96%) possible points for punctual and consistent meeting attendance (2 points); students' scored 160 out of 166 (96%) possible points for collaborative participation (2 points); students' scored 155 out of 166 (93%) possible points for responsiveness to emails, calls and texts (2 points); students' scored 228 out of a 249 (92%) possible points for timely submission of materials (3 points). The new stretch target (90% which was increased from 70%) was met as

93% of the students' received 7 points or higher out of the 10 points possible.

**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 are pleased with this year's results as 93% of the student's scored 7 or higher compared to 86% last year. This increase is impressive in that we had 48 more students evaluated this year and students demonstrated an overall 6% increase in their abilities to work as a team. We think isolating this learning outcome to only the capstone course, clarifying rubrics, discussions of academic rigor and being sure students had a greater understanding of project expectations resulted in higher quality projects. As a result of last year's assessment, the instructor for the course worked more closely one on one with each of the groups regarding group dynamics and its importance to the course and their professional development.

**Review:**

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed  
☒ Satisfactory

**Measure: 2.2**

Students in ADV 4941 or PUR 4941: Internship, will demonstrate effective teamwork behaviors during their internship experience. Internship supervisors responding to the question "how would you describe your intern's teamwork abilities" on the evaluation, will rate the intern as outstanding, very good, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory. At least 90% of the students will be rated as at least 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

Supervisor Evaluations rated interns teamwork abilities for Spring 2015 N= 43; 36 were rated outstanding; 6 were rated very good; 1 was rated needs improvement; 0 were rated unsatisfactory; for spring (98%) were rated very good or outstanding. Summer 2015, N= 56, 45 of 56 rated outstanding; 6 of 56 rated very good; 1 of 56 rated needs improvement; 1 of 56 rated unsatisfactory; for summer (96%) were rated very good or outstanding. Fall 2015 N = 50; 40 of 50 rated outstanding; 9 of 50 rated very good; 1 of 50 rated needs improvement; 0 of 50 rated unsatisfactory; for fall (98%) were rated very good or outstanding. Calendar year totals N= 149: 145 of 149 rated outstanding; 24 of 149 rated very good; 3 of 149 rated needs improvement; 1 of 149 rated unsatisfactory; 145 out of 149 (97%) rated very good or outstanding, 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:**

This year 97% of student interns were rated by their supervisors as very good or outstanding compared to 98% last year. This year we had 149 students enrolled, compared to 168 last year. We do not feel 1% is a significant difference. However, we did notice we did not have granular data in last year's report for the summer 2014, and in this calendar year it was the summer semester that had the lowest percentage of very good and outstanding at 96%.

**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).

We think emphasizing the learning measure in 2.1 to the capstone course, clarifying rubrics, faculty discussions of academic rigor and being sure students had a greater understanding of project expectations resulted in higher quality projects. As a result of last year's assessment, the instructor for the course worked more closely one on one with each of the groups regarding group dynamics and its importance and may then also influenced their internship experience as well. As we looked at the granular data for measure 2.1 all of the categories (other than professional behavior which was 100% both years) showed a significant increase from last year; punctuality and attendance increased 12%, collaborative participation increased 7%, responsiveness increased 11% and timely submissions increased 6%. We are pleased that the changes made to the process and within the classroom seem to be improving student learning.

**Reflective Statement Review:**

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

**Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:**

Excellent presentation of granular data for both measures. 10/9 AD

- Zack's notes 11/14/16
- Measure 2.1: Looks pretty good. Good explanation of the changes that were made from last year to this year.
- Measure 2.2: Looks pretty good.
- Reflective Statement: Good. Good explanation of the things that may have contributed to improved results.
- As with outcome 1, if you are consistently at or near 100% it may be time to consider looking at other areas to assess that may provide more useful data for the program.
- Zacks' notes 11/16/16
- In Measure 2.1 at first I was hesitant because the improvement in scores is accredited to collecting data from just MMC 4411 rather than MMC 4411 and ADV 4101, clarifying rubrics, discussion of rigor, better explaining of project expectations, and emphasizing group dynamics and its importance to the course and professional development.  
Upon first reading I was thinking that some of those things are really just changes to collect better data, and that the new data collection was probably the main reason for the increased scores. I didn't think it really indicated that student knowledge improved. But, after rereading it

I remember that we encourage outcomes to assess what we want our students to Do, Know, and VALUE. On the second read I began to see this more as a "Value" measure and realize that by emphasizing the importance of group dynamics and the importance of rigor, students likely learned the value of hard work and being a good team member, and that some of the improvement probably results from that.

- I think this is sufficient for demonstrating a "closed loop"

**Attachments:** Measure 2.1 Sp15-Fa15.docx Intern Supervisor Evaluation.xlsx Measure 2.2 Results.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 in the major's capstone course MMC 4411: Advertising Campaigns will complete their final group project assignment and will demonstrate their ability to satisfactorily use appropriate research methods in the final group project. Student work will be evaluated by an industry panel utilizing the following 5-point scale (1= research was satisfactorily presented; 2= research was satisfactorily presented, cited, and summarized; 3= research was satisfactorily presented, cited, summarized and appropriate for the project and objective; 4= research was satisfactorily presented, cited, summarized, appropriate for the project and objective. Additionally it was smartly organized. 5=research was satisfactorily presented, cited, summarized, appropriate for the project and objective. Additionally it was smartly organized and visually appealing. A minimum of 75% of the student's campaign books (final projects) 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

Students in the major's capstone course MMC 4411: Advertising Campaigns completed their final group project assignment and demonstrated their ability to satisfactorily use appropriate research methods in the final group project. Student group final projects (5 student per group) were evaluated by an industry panel utilizing the above 5-point scale (5 being the highest). Spring 15: N= 5 group projects (25 students); 1 group was rated 5, 3 groups were rated 4, 1 group was rated 3, 0 were rated 2 or below. In the fall semester N=3 projects (15 students); 0 groups were rated 5, 1 group was rated 4, 1 group was rated 3, 1 was rated 2, 0 were rated 1. Totals for the year N=8; 1 group was rated 5, 4 groups were rated 4, 2 groups were rated 3, 1 was rated 2, 0 were rated 1. The target was met as 87% of the group projects were rated 3 or higher.



**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:**

This year's result increased by 4%, up from 83% last year to 87% this year.

**Review:**

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed  
☒ Satisfactory

**Measure: 3.2**

Students enrolled in MMC 3420 will fill out pretest surveys with one question on research terminology, processes, or functions (that will be explained and demonstrated later in the term) to help determine the level of research methods knowledge they have coming into the course. At the end of the term, a posttest will be conducted to test their level of understanding and awareness of research terminology, processes, or functions. The target is that 80% or more of the students will answer each of the questions on terminology, process or functions on the post test accurately.

**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 in MMC 3420 were asked two pretest and posttest questions: Question 1: Asked students "what is the difference between qualitative and quantitative research?" N= 185 on the pretest, 42% of the students were able to correctly describe the definition or articulate the distinctions of qualitative and quantitative research. N= 182 on the posttest, 79% of the students correctly answered the question to identify methods of qualitative research. Question 2: Asked student to "describe standard deviation". N = 185 on the pretest, 32% of the students were able to articulate the meaning of standard deviation. N = 182 on the posttest, 81% of students answered the question about normal distribution and standard deviation correctly. As 79% of the students answered question 1 correctly, and 81% of the students answered question 2 correctly on the posttest, technically we did not meet the 80% target (other than in allowing for a typical 1% margin of error) on both questions.

**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:**

Last year we were unable to collect data, the results this year seem to confirm that we are

improving student learning outcomes. The faculty have been really working to improve student learning in this course, and will continue their work this semester as they revise the course and assignments/projects. They also are planning to further work on improving the course during the next FCTL (May 9-12) summer conference.

### 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).

We are interpreting these results as promising, given the dramatic shifts we've been implementing in MMC 3420 Research Methods course over several semesters. One reason we did not greatly surpass our expected outcomes may be due to the fact that the data is coming from a large lecture class. The curriculum changes that were approved this year for implementation in 2016-2017 catalog will require student's be an Ad-PR, Journalism or R-TV major or Mass Communication Minor as a prerequisite. During this transition period we also are continuing to move toward more project-based, applied skills to improve student learning outcomes. This change to majors and minors only will allow not only for more specific, discipline research methods, but also allow for more applied-project based assignments/case studies in a smaller class setting. This greater emphasis on research methods earlier in their academic program will ultimately affect performance in the capstone course, their internships and their careers.

### Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

### Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

This outcomes states: Students will demonstrate an understanding of quantitative and qualitative research methods and basic statistical analysis. Measure 3.1 is excellent and the presentation of granular data clearly shows how students performed. Measure 3.2 is less clear, specifically the discussion on demonstrating knowledge about the normal distribution and a standard deviation. A review of the measure which is attached provides clarity but the write up would benefit from a more thorough discussion on how statistical knowledge is assessed. Moreover, some consideration could be made to how this measure assesses "an understanding of basic statistical analysis." Also in Measure 3.2 you state that improvements were made from the previous year but explain that data were not collected the year before. This should be changed to reflect that no improvement was seen. - AD 10/23

- Zack's notes 11/14/16
- Measure 3.1: Looks pretty good. As with the other outcomes perhaps some discussion of what may need improvement for those who scored less than 5 would be helpful for the program. Also some discussion of what may have caused the 4% improvement would be helpful.
- Measure 3.2: Looks pretty good. I agree with the reviewer that when it asks "did your results show an improvement..." "no" should be checked rather than "yes".
- Reflective statement: Good discussion of the curricular changes and move toward projects and applied skills.
- Zack's notes 11/16/16

- For measure 3.1 the reflective statement mentions that things have been implemented in MMC 3420, but it does not specifically mention any particular change made previously and how that affected this data. It then talks about the prerequisite change and plans for more applied projects, but it indicates that these things take effect in 2016-17 and will likely cause improvement in the future. So there is no evidence to support a closed loop here yet.

**Attachments:** Measure 3.2 Results Dodd 2015.docx Measure3.1Sp15-Fa15.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

Students in PUR3100: Writing for PR will complete a pre (early in the term test) and post test (at the end of the term) on AP Style rules and guidelines. Tests will be reviewed by faculty, students should score at least 50% better on the post test than they did on the pre- test; the target will be that 90% of the students will score a grade of 75 or better on the 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

Data was collected from three sections of the course for spring 2015 and four sections of the course for fall 2015. The results were not what was expected; the average score for all students on the pretest was 86.5 and 84.9 for the posttest. As the overall pretest score was higher than the posttest, it was not possible to score 50% better on the posttest than the pretest. N= 131 students in total that took the pretest over both semesters, 109 students scored 75 or better on the posttest, therefore only 83.2% scored 75 or higher. As students' didn't seem to do as well on the posttest, further analysis on the granular data and discussion among faculty indicated that the students at the end of the semester didn't seem to put in the same effort on the posttest as they did on the pretest. In all sections there were a number of students (total of 18 students) either had a zero or had no data for the posttest (did not take the posttest), or may have not completed the course which may have significantly skewed the results. However, if we exclude the zero (we think it is unlikely that a student who completed the exam would have scored a zero) or missing data, then of the 113 students that have scores, 109 of them scored a 75 or above = 96% and the target on the posttest would have been 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:**

Data was collected from seven sections for the year, last year we had no data. Faculty felt the students were much more focused and tried harder on the pretest than the posttest. They felt that by the time they took the posttest they either were more concerned about final exams and/or not concerned about not doing well on this posttest as it would not significantly effect their grade. While some of the students' showed significant improvement on the posttest, we will need to further isolate some of the variables to effectively measure student learning on this outcome.

**Review:**

- ☒ Revision or explanation needed  
☐ Satisfactory

**Measure: 4.2**

Students in PUR3100: Writing for PR will be able to write in a concise, journalistic style. A panel of industry professionals will review the students' final projects from PUR 3100 and will rate them in each category: used AP style and guidelines, concise writing, punctuation and grammar, and accuracy. Using a 5 point scale (1=poor, 2=fair, 3=acceptable, 4=good and 5=excellent) 75% of the students will score 3 or higher in each area.

**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 in PUR3100: Writing for PR were evaluated on their ability to write in a concise, journalistic style. A panel of industry professionals reviewed a sample of randomly selected students' final projects from PUR 3100 and rated them in each category: used AP style and guidelines, concise writing, punctuation and grammar, and accuracy using the 5 point scale above. The target was met as 100% of the students scored 3 or higher in each category.

**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:**

Last year we had no data for this measure. This year 100% of the randomly selected projects were rated 3.0 or higher by industry professionals in each of the categories.

**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).

The assessment results this year on pretest vs. posttest did not align with the expected outcomes. Although the results seem to indicate that the students are doing relatively well with AP style the faculty still believe this to be a challenge for students'. Discussions are taking place about how we might find better measure/s for this outcome. Preliminary suggestions include using a more applied student learning measure (rather than from the book). The results seem to indicate that students' may be better at choose the correct AP style such as on the pretest/posttest, but may not be able to apply AP style as well in their own writing. We will continue to look toward ways to improve this student learning outcome with next year's plan.

### Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

### Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Similar to the Measure above, you note that there was improvement this year on both measures 4.1 and 4.2 but also state that no data were collected in the previous year. Please correct both of these measures to indicate that no improvement was demonstrated. I agree that Measure 4.1 may not be the best way to measure this particular outcome. AD 10/23

- Zack's notes 11/15/16
- Measure 4.1: (\*note for the plan. You really have 2 targets listed for this measure. Scores will improve by 50% from pre to post test, and 90% of students will score 75% or better on the post test. Considering only including 1 of these targets in the measure on the next plan.) ... While the post-test target was not met the scores still seem pretty good, what was surprising to me is how high the pre-test scores are. It seems like the students are coming into the course with pretty good knowledge. As you mention in the reflective statement perhaps it is time to take a different approach for this measure.
- Measure 4.2: As with some of the earlier outcomes if you could provide some disaggregated data and analysis it might be helpful for the program. 100% scored a 3 or better in each area, but overall were they just meeting the 3 benchmark or were they recieving 4s and 5s too. Is there one of the 4 areas of evaluation that students seem to struggle with more than the others, etc.
- Reflective Statement: Good reflection for measure 4.1. I like applied approach ideas.... I'd like to see some reflection on 4.2 as well.
- I agree with the reviewer that if there was no data last year you should check "no" when it asks if there was improvement.

**Attachments:** Measure4.2SP15-Fa15.docx Measure 4.1 by class.docx Measure 4.1 PrePostMateriaSamples.docx

Top

### Outcome: 5

Students will demonstrate the ability to use critical thinking and analysis skills in final projects.

**Academic Learning Compact (ALC):**

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

**Measure: 5.1**

Students in PUR 4400: Crisis Communication in their final group project will successfully analyze a company or organization's ability to respond in crisis. Faculty will complete rubrics on the assignment a three point scale will be used for the introduction and a seven point scale will be used to assess the strengths, weaknesses, recommendations and writing quality of the project with zero being the lowest and seven the highest. It is expected that 70% of students will score a 2.0 or higher on the introduction and a 5.0 or better on the 7 point scale in each of the other categories (strengths, weaknesses, recommendations and writing).

**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 total of 66 students in PUR 4400 completed final group projects and analyzed a company or organization's ability to respond in crisis. Faculty evaluated 10 group projects (average 7 students per group) to assess the students' ability to use critical thinking and analysis skills. On a 3 point scale (0 being the lowest) on the introduction we measured their ability to describe the organization and the focus of their analysis including a preview and brief summary of the concepts applied, 7 groups scored 2 points and 3 groups scored 1 point. Therefore, 70% of the students scored 2.0 or better on the introduction. The target was met. Using a 7 point scale (0 being the lowest): In the category of strengths - to measure their ability to identify and explain strengths in terms of theory and provide examples that the strengths exist, 9 groups scored 7 points and 1 group scored 6 points. As 100% of the the students scored 5.0 or better, the target was met. In the category of weaknesses - to measure their ability to identify and explain problems in terms of theory and provide examples that problems exist, 7 groups scored 7 points, two groups scored 6 points, and 1 group scored 5 points. As 100% of the students scored 5.0 or better, the target was met. In the category of recommendations - to measure their ability to describe steps the theory suggest should be taken post crisis, specific steps the organization could take to improve its crisis communication and provide a description of how the solutions will improve crisis communication in the organization, 7 groups scored 7 points, and 3 groups scored 6 points. Again, 100% of the students scored 5 points or better, the target was met. In the category of writing quality, using correct grammar, clarity and style consistency, 6 groups scored 7 points and 4 groups scored 6 points. This last category also 100% of the students scored 5.0 or better, 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:**

This was a new outcome and measure.

**Review:**

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

**Measure: 5.2**

Students in ADV 4101: Advertising Copywriting will demonstrate critical thinking and analysis skills in their final communication project. The student's projects will be reviewed by a panel of industry professionals and rated in each category: applied appropriate strategies, demonstrated appropriate research methods, expressed thoughts clearly, used effective analysis and project was well written. Using a 5 point scale (1=poor, 2=fair, 3=acceptable, 4=good and 5=excellent) 75% of the students will score 3 or higher in each area.

**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 in ADV 4101: Advertising Copywriting student's projects will be reviewed by a panel of industry professionals and rated in each category: applied appropriate strategies, demonstrated appropriate research methods, expressed thoughts clearly, used effective analysis and project was well written using the 5 point scale above. N=10 projects (40 students - 4 in each group); the target was met as 100% of the projects were rated 3 or higher in each category.

The granular data showed:

Applied appropriate strategies 1 was rated excellent; 6 were rated good and 3 were rated acceptable. Demonstrated appropriate research methods: 4 were rated as excellent, 4 were rated good and two were rated acceptable.

Expressed thoughts clearly: 3 were rated excellent, 4 were rated as good, 3 were rated acceptable.

Used effective analysis: 3 were rated excellent, 4 were rated as good, 3 were rated acceptable

Writing Skills: 2 were rated excellent, 3 were rated good, 5 were rated acceptable.

**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:**

This was a new measure, we did not use this measure 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 was a new outcome and measures. In PUR 4400, the ten groups consistently satisfied the criteria. There was, however, some disparity in the groups' performance. The results indicate that the groups consistently excelled at identifying the strengths of an organization's performance, but were less skilled at identifying weaknesses that could lead to a crisis situation. The groups also had some notable difficulty in succinctly introducing the criteria of the theories they intended to apply in their cases. This difficulty in succinctly describing the theoretical criteria for application may have also contributed to disparity in the results regarding recommendations and writing style. We will respond to these findings by devoting more class time to explaining how theories convert to criteria for analysis and to having students engage in multiple class activities asking them to identify and apply theoretical criteria to case studies and simulations.

In ADV 4101 the students' greatest strength seemed to be in the area of research methods, the weakest area was in applied appropriate strategies. Students in both courses seemed to have some difficulty in the applying the theories and strategies that they learned in class. This coming year both courses will invest more class time and case studies/assignments on applied theories and strategies to improve student learning.

**Reflective Statement Review:**

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

**Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:**

Excellent discussion of measures, results, and how you plan to use these data to improve the program. AD 10/23

- Zack's notes 11/15/16
- Measure 5.1: looks pretty good. With everything already at 100% I wonder where you go from here though. Of course, since this is a new measure you should collect at least another year of data before making any drastic changes, but just something to keep in mind.
- Measure 5.2: Looks pretty good. Good inclusion of the disaggregate data.
- Reflective Statement: Good job digging into the data to find the strengths and weaknesses. Good plan to create improvement by devoting more class time and activities to cover the caps related to theories.

**Attachments:** Measure5.2AP15-Fa15.docx 5.1 Results PUR4400 2015.docx

Top

**Outcome: 6**

Students will demonstrate proficiency in performance of core skills performed in their internships.

**Academic Learning Compact (ALC):**

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



**Measure: 6.1**

Students in ADV 4941 or PUR 4941: Internship, will demonstrate proficiency in performance of core skills performed on the evaluation completed by professionals who supervise interns. Supervisors will rate each student intern as outstanding, very good, needs improvement, or satisfactory in each of the following core skills: AP style guidelines, research skills, time management skills and teamwork abilities. This year we are stretching the target for this measure (from 70% last year) to at least 80% of the student will be rated as at least very good or outstanding in each core skill.

**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= 128: 52 Outstanding, 67 Very Good, 9 Needs Improvement, 0 Unsatisfactory, **93% scored Outstanding or Very Good in use of AP style**. Research Skills: N=148, 90 Outstanding, 53 Very Good, 5 Needs Improvement, 0 Unsatisfactory, **97% were rated Very Good or Outstanding in research skills**. Time Management Skills: N= 149, 89 Outstanding, 49 Very Good, 10 Needs Improvement, 1 Unsatisfactory, **93% were rated Very Good or Outstanding in time management skills**. Teamwork: N = 149, 121 Outstanding, 24 Very Good, 3 Needs Improvement, 1 Unsatisfactory, **97% were rated Very Good or Outstanding in teamwork ability**. Per DRC recommendation this year we also included overall Quality of Work, N = 149: 94 Outstanding, 49 Very Good, 6 Needs Improvement, 0 Unsatisfactory, **96% were rated Very Good or Outstanding in overall quality of work**. The stretch target was met in each of the categories. In comparison to last year's results AP Writing style decreased from 100% last year to 93% this year; Research skills decreased from 99% last year to 97% this year; time management skills decreased slightly from 93.5% last year to 93% this year; and teamwork ability decreased from 99% last year to 97% this year. This was the first year we included an overall quality of work category. Although we are pleased that we met our stretch targets in all categories, all categories did show a decrease from the previous 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:**

While we believe that this may be at least partially due to the fact that the numbers of students evaluated increased by approximately 40 students, we did see an increase in the number of students that were rated as needs improvement. The category that we are most concerned about is in the use of AP style as there was a 7% decrease from last year. This coming year we will need to work with students to strengthen their use of AP style, continue to work on improving their research and time management skills. Although there was only a slight decrease in research skill from the prior year, there were still a larger number of students that were rated as needs improvement than we would like to see. As we were beginning to see these results, as we mentioned in the plan we made some prerequisite changes (majors only) this academic year to the research methods course that will go into effect with 2016-17 catalog and Drs. Melissa Dodd and Bridget Rubenking have been working on changing the content of the course to be a more project based skills class setting rather than the

former large lecture format. They will also be working on curriculum improvements during the Spring FCTL workshop to improve student learning outcomes. We also believe the increased emphasis on writing and AP style in the PUR 3100 course now being taught by more full-time faculty than adjunct over a period of time we should see improvement of student AP style and writing skills.

**Review:**

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

**Measure: 6.2**

Students in ADV 4941 or PUR 4941: Internship, will rate how well their internship provided experience in the following core skills: applying AP style guidelines, research skills, time management and teamwork abilities. It is expected that 70% of the students will rate their intern experience on their final evaluation in each of the core skills as outstanding or very good (on the scale of outstanding, very good, fair or poor).

**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

This data was collected as initially intended during 2015 from the students' perspectives on a final student evaluation of their internship using a Qualtrics survey, however in merging the faculty member's account the student survey result data was lost.

However, on the Ad-PR program specific graduating senior survey Question 3 "Agree or disagree: my internship helped me to develop my research skills for a profession in Advertising-Public Relations" N=77, 35 students strongly agreed (45%); 27 students agreed (35%); 11 were neutral (14%); 3 disagreed (4%); and 1 strongly disagreed (1%). Therefore, 62 students (80%) strongly agreed or agreed that their internship helped them develop research skills. This is the closest data we are able to provide for this learning outcome. The results from the core skills on the student survey was lost. We are continuing to administer this survey and should have results to report next cycle.

**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:**

This was a new measure for 2015, in the previous years we only asked students whether they agreed or disagree that their internship was valuable to their educational and professional development. We will continue to administer the survey through this next cycle.

**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).

The assessment results from internship supervisors indicated that our students were weakest in the area of AP style, which is line with what our faculty have indicated. This coming year we will need to work with students to strengthen their use of AP style (beginning with PUR 3100 as indicated in measure 4.1), continue to work on improving their research and time management skills. Although there was only a slight decrease in research skills from the prior year, there were still a larger number of students that were rated as needs improvement than we would like to see. As we were beginning to see these results along with previous assessment cycles, we made some prerequisite changes (majors only) this academic year to the research methods course that will go into effect with 2016-17 catalog and Drs. Melissa Dodd and Bridget Rubenking have been working on changing the content of the course to be a more project based skills class setting rather than the former large lecture format. They will also be working on curriculum improvements during the Spring FCTL workshop to improve student learning outcomes. We also believe the increased emphasis on writing and AP style in the PUR 3100 course now being taught by more full-time faculty than adjuncts over a period of time we should see improvement of student AP style and writing skills. In the next assessment cycle we should also be able to have data on the other core skills from the students' perspectives.

**Reflective Statement Review:**

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

**Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:**

It is unfortunate that data were lost from the student survey but the substituted data are appropriate for the measure. Your reflective statement demonstrates a concerted effort to use the results of assessment to make program changes that will benefit the students. AD 10/23

- Zack's notes 11/15/16
- Measure 6.1: looks pretty good.
- Measure 6.2: Good considering the lost data. I greatly appreciate that you made the effort to find and report reasonable replacement data.
- Reflective statement: Good. good analysis of the issues and explanation of what the program will do going forward.

**Attachments:** student internship evaluation.xlsx Measure 6.1 Sp15-Fa15.docx Intern Supervisor Evaluation.xlsx

Top

**Outcome: 7**

Students will understand and demonstrate proficiency in the use of creative strategies and skills.

**Academic Learning Compact (ALC):**

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

**Measure: 7.1**

Students in ADV 4941 or PUR 4941: Internship, will demonstrate proficiency in creative skills during the internship experience. Internship supervisors responding to the question "how would you describe your intern's creative skills" on the evaluation will rate the intern as outstanding, very good, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory. At least 70% of the students will be rated as at least 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

Internship supervisors rated the proficiency of their intern's creative skills in the internship experience as: N= 142 students; 84 were rated as outstanding, 52 were rated as very good, 6 were rated as needs improvement, 0 were rated unsatisfactory. Therefore the target was met as 96% were rated as very good or outstanding. We are pleased with these initial results of our students' creative skills.

**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:**

This was the first year we used this measure to have intern supervisors to rate their intern's creative skills.

**Review:**

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

**Measure: 7.2**

Students who have completed the graduating senior survey Ad-PR program specific question [https://jfe.qualtrics.com/preview/SV\\_0kWGTbW9ddIXLa5](https://jfe.qualtrics.com/preview/SV_0kWGTbW9ddIXLa5) number 12: "Agree or disagree: My Ad-PR classes helped me develop creative solutions to communication problems" using the scale of strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree, 70% will agree or strongly agree.

**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

Of the 77 Students who completed the graduating senior survey Ad-PR program specific question "Agree or disagree: My Ad-PR classes helped me develop creative solutions to communication problems" using the scale of strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree, 46 responded strongly agree, 28 responded agree, 3 were neutral, 0 disagree, 0 strongly disagreed. Therefore, 96% agreed or strongly agreed; 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:**

This was a new measure for this outcome. In the past we had only assessed creative skills along with research skills through class projects. As the student's seemed to be doing well from the faculty's perspective, this year we wanted to look at each learning outcome more specifically as students were preparing to enter the job market both from the intern supervisor's and student's perspectives.

**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).

As this was a new learning outcome and measures, we are pleased with these initial results both from the intern supervisor's and students' perspectives.

**Reflective Statement Review:**

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

**Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:**

It would be helpful to know the response rate for the graduating senior survey. The reflective statement could also include a discussion on how these results are useful to the program as these are new measures. AD 10/23

- Zack's notes 11/15/16
- Looks good. As these are new measures there is not a whole of analysis to be done, but as the reviewer noted some discussion of how the results might be useful would be good. I also agree with the reviewer that the response rate for the graduating senior survey should be reported.

**Attachments:** Intern Supervisor Evaluation.xlsx Measure 7.1 SP15-Fa15.docx Measure 7.2 Sp15-Fa15.docx

Top

### Outcome: 8

Students will demonstrate proficiency in written communication skills.

#### Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

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

### Measure: 8.1

Students in ADV 4941 or PUR 4941: Internship, will demonstrate proficiency in written communication skills during the internship experience. Internship supervisors responding to the question "how would you describe your intern's writing skills" on the evaluation will rate the intern as outstanding, very good, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory. At least 80% of the students will be rated as at least 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

Students in ADV 4941 or PUR 4941: Internship, supervisors responding to the question "how would you describe your intern's writing skills" on the evaluation N= 144; 66 were rated as outstanding, 71 were rated very good, 7 were rated as needs improvement, and 0 unsatisfactory. The target was met as 95% of the students were rated as very good or outstanding on their writing skills.

#### 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:

Last year 98% of the students were rated as outstanding or very good on their writing skills from their internship employers. This year approximately 35 more students were evaluated than last year. However, the faculty have felt recently student's writing skills are not at the level they would like them to be. We are placing greater emphasis on writing in a number of classes.

#### Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed

☒ Satisfactory

**Measure: 8.2**

Students who have completed the graduating senior survey Ad-PR program specific question [https://jfe1.qualtrics.com/preview/SV\\_0kWGTbW9ddIXLa5](https://jfe1.qualtrics.com/preview/SV_0kWGTbW9ddIXLa5) number 2: "Agree or disagree: My internship(s) helped me develop my writing skills for a profession in Advertising/Public Relations" using the scale of strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree, 80% will agree or strongly agree.

**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

Of the 77 Students who completed the graduating senior survey Ad-PR program specific question "Agree or disagree: my internship(s) helped me to develop my writing skills for a profession in Advertising/Public Relations" using the scale of strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree; 47 responded strongly agree, 19 responded agree, 8 were neutral, 2 disagree, 1 strongly disagreed. Therefore, 86% agreed or strongly agreed; 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:**

This was a new measure for this outcome. This year we wanted to collect data from the student's perspectives as they were preparing to enter the job market.

**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).

As writing skills are essential in the Ad-PR field, we plan to continue to emphasize and reinforce writing skills as well as their use of AP style throughout the program.

**Reflective Statement Review:**

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

### Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Same comments from Outcome 7 apply to Outcome 8. AD 10/23

- Zack's notes 11/15/16
- I agree with the reviewer the same comments as outcome 7 apply here.

**Attachments:** Measure 8.1 Sp15-Fa15.docx Measure 8.2 Sp15-Fa15.docx Intern Supervisor Evaluation.xlsx Measure 8.2.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 MMC 3420 and PUR 3100  
 Assessment rubrics are used in ADV 4101: Advertising Copywriting; PUR 3100: Writing for PR, MMC 4411: Ad/PR Campaigns; PUR 4400 Crisis Communication  
 Internship Employers Evaluations

### 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-post test was used in MMC 3420 Mass Communication Research Methods and PUR 3100 Writing for Public Relations

### Review:

- ☒ Revision or explanation needed
- ☐ Satisfactory

### Review Comments:

Please explain how "observation" and "other method" are used.

Under surveys I would include student surveys as students completing an internship are asked to fill out a survey.

Under miscellaneous assessment methods I would check other and include the professional panels here. - AD 10/23

- Zack's notes 11/15/16
- I agree with the reviewer. In the first box "observation" and "other method" are both checked but I don't see an explanation for them.
- I also agree with the reviewers other comments regarding the survey and professional panels.
- Typically in this section I also like to see the measures that are tied to each instrument listed in the explanations.

**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:**

UCF Graduating Senior Survey using program specific questions for measure 7.2 (creative strategies & skills) and 8.2 (written communication skills).

**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
- ☐ 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

**Criteria:**

Please comment on implemented and planned changes

- ☐ 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

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

At this time we do not plan to make further changes to the academic process. During this academic assessment cycle we made significant improvements in collecting data. The only issue we had this past cycle was with the loss of data in merging a Qualtrics account for a faculty member.

### Changes to Curriculum:

- ☒ Revise and/or Enforce Prerequisites

### 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: 3 Measure: 2**

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

As one of the areas our students seemed to demonstrate weakness was in the area of research skills, both in the required core course MMC 3420 Mass Media Research Methods and was also coming up in internship supervisor evaluations that students needed improvement in their research skills. This past year we submitted and received approval to change the prerequisites on the course for Mass Communication (Ad-PR, Journalism and Radio-Television) majors and Mass Communication Minors; the prerequisite changes are now effective for the 2016-17 catalog. Particularly two faculty members have been working on the course content, which has been significantly redeveloped from an academic approach to research toward a more applied research approach. The size of the course has been also been reduced and allows for more applied projects.

### Describe the data that you collected to assess the change:

Students in MMC 3420 were asked two pretest and posttest questions: Question 1: Asked students "what is the difference between qualitative and quantitative research?" N= 185 on the pretest, 42% of the students were able to correctly describe the definition or articulate the distinctions of qualitative and quantitative research. N= 182 on the

- ☒ 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 is not clear what change is planned for the next assessment cycle. It appears as though the same assessment measures will be used next year. AD 10/23

- Zack's notes 11/15/16
- In this section and throughout the rest of the report you mention and lot of good changes that program has made or is thinking about making that will affect future results. Many of these will be great opportunities to "close the loop" in future assessment reports.
- The one measure where I think the program has demonstrated a closed loop in measure 2.1 I don't see that identified in this section of the report. There is sufficient evidence earlier in the report to give credit for closing the loop, but in the future we would also like to see that reiterated in this section of the report.
- Remember for future reports that for a closed loop we need to

posttest, 79% of the students correctly answered the question to identify methods of qualitative research. Question 2: Asked student to "describe standard deviation". N = 185 on the pretest, 32% of the students were able to articulate the meaning of standard deviation. N = 182 on the posttest, 81% of students answered the question about normal distribution and standard deviation correctly. As 79% of the students answered question 1 correctly, and 81% of the students answered question 2 correctly on the posttest, technically we did not meet the 80% target (other than in allowing for a typical 1% margin of error) on both questions.

### **Describe Improvement(s):**

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

We are interpreting these results as promising, given the dramatic shifts we've been implementing in MMC 3420 Research Methods course over several semesters. One reason we did not greatly surpass our expected outcomes may be due to the fact that the data is coming from a large lecture class. The curriculum changes that were approved this year for implementation in 2016-2017 catalog will require student's be an Ad-PR, Journalism or R-TV major or Mass Communication Minor as a prerequisite. During this transition period we also are continuing to move toward more project-based, applied skills to improve student learning outcomes. This change to majors and minors only will allow not only for more specific, discipline research methods, but also allow for more applied-project based assignments/case studies in a smaller class setting. This greater emphasis on research methods earlier in their academic program will ultimately affect performance in the capstone course, their internships and their careers.

see examples of changes that were made previously that resulted in improved student learning in the results for this year. Changes to data collection and things of that nature are great changes that show formative assessment, but only changes that improve student learning qualify as closing the loop.

### **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:**

We are interpreting these results as promising, given the dramatic shifts we've been implementing in MMC 3420 Research Methods course over several semesters. One reason we did not greatly surpass our expected outcomes may be due to the fact that the data is coming from a large lecture class. The curriculum changes that were approved this year for implementation in 2016-2017 catalog will require student's be an Ad-PR, Journalism or R-TV major or Mass Communication Minor as a prerequisite. During this transition period we also are continuing to move toward more project-based, applied skills to improve student learning outcomes. This change to majors and minors only will allow not only for more specific, discipline research methods, but also allow for more applied-project based assignments/case studies in a smaller class setting. This greater emphasis on research methods earlier in their academic program will ultimately affect performance in the capstone course, their internships and their careers.

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

Students in MMC 3420 were asked two pretest and posttest questions:

Question 1: Asked students "what is the difference between qualitative and quantitative research?" N= 185 on the pretest, 42% of the students were able to correctly describe the definition or articulate the distinctions of qualitative and quantitative research. N= 182 on the posttest, 79% of the students correctly answered the question to identify methods of qualitative research. Question 2: Asked student to "describe standard deviation". N = 185 on the pretest, 32% of the students were able to articulate the meaning of standard deviation. N = 182 on the posttest, 81% of students answered the question about normal distribution and standard deviation correctly. As 79% of the students answered question 1 correctly, and 81% of the students answered question 2 correctly on the posttest, technically we did not meet the 80% target (other than in allowing for a typical 1% margin of error) on both questions.

- ☐ 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
- ☐ Collect and Analyze Additional Data and Information
- ☐ Change Method of Data Collection
- ☒ Other implemented or planned change(s)

#### 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: 1 Measure: 1

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

In assessment discussions we decided to eliminate variables and inconsistencies in hopes of improving student learning. Discussions took place regarding interpretations of rubrics and the faculty member met with student groups one-on-one to be sure project expectations were clear.

##### Describe the data that you collected to assess the change:

Students in MMC 4411: Advertising Campaigns were evaluated on their final group project by faculty observation using the above 5 point

scale. N = 83 students, 9 out of 83 (11%) rated 5; 23 out of 83 (28%) rated 4; 40 out of 83 (48%) rated 3; 11 out of 83 (13%) rated 2; 0 rated 1. Therefore, the target was met as 87% (72 out of 83) earned 3.0 or higher on presenting their proposals, plans and strategies by faculty observation.

### **Describe Improvement(s):**

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

Last year we had quite a bit of inconsistency and variables in measuring this learning outcome. For example, we were looking at multiple courses and also measure 1.1 the target was a 3.0 and a 4.0 for measure 1.2. After analyzing the results last year, it was determined in order to be able for this learning outcome to be effective for assessment, we needed to eliminate the variables and inconsistencies. In this year's plan we made both targets for the measure be a 3.0 as we also limited the learning outcome to one course, MMC 4411 capstone class. The faculty also discussed academic rigor and interpretations of the rubrics, expectations were made more clear between faculty and students. The faculty member also met one-to-one with the groups to be sure they better understood the expected criteria and learning outcomes for the final projects and the course.

- ☐ 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.**

We are not changing the student outcome or measure at this time. We will continue to monitor and look for additional ways to improve student learning in addition to the increased communication between faculty and students in expectations.

### **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).

As indicated in the past few assessment cycles we have increased faculty discussions and input into the assessment cycle and made necessary changes as appropriate. In outcome measures 1 & 2 we worked on clarifying interpretations of expectations as well as eliminating variables and inconsistencies to improve student learning.

We think that this year's results show improvements in student learning as a result. Results in past cycles indicated student's needed improvement in their research methods skills both as evidenced in measures 3.2 and 6.1. We made curriculum changes in prerequisites, reduced class size and have started and plan to revise course content to include more applied research and applied research assignments.

This has been a slower process, but results (although preliminary) seem to indicate we are going in the right direction. Although outcome 5 is new, the results seemed to identify a need to increase class time on theories and how to convert that criteria to analysis and application activities. Outcome 4, measure 1 we did not get the results we expected with the pretest/posttest to help improve student learning in the area of AP style writing. We are thinking that we may need to identify a more applied student learning measure for this outcome, possibly in next year's plan. Data also from internship supervisors in 6.1 also indicate the need for improvement in the area of AP style

### Review Criteria:

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

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

### Review:

Excellent progress has been made an assessment measures have been used to improve the program. They have identified areas where the program can be improved and when measures are not as useful as they could be. Many changes have been made recently making indicator 8 unrealistic at this point in time. AD 10/23

- Zack's notes 11/15/16
- Overall this is a very good assessment

writing. PUR 3100 Writing for Public Relations as a core course is essential for AP style writing. We now have a full-time faculty member who is teaching this course and looking to help identify areas for improved student learning.

- report.
- While this report is already rated very highly the reviewer and I have made suggestions throughout that will not help improve the rating, but can further strengthen the report, assessment, and the program. We encourage you to review them and consider these comments for future reports.
  - The only rubric item we did not give credit for is #8 which relates to a fully "closed loop" showing improvement. You indicate that you believe the changes in outcomes 1 and 2 and the corresponding improvement qualify as improved student learning. I feel that while those are excellent changes that led to improved results, the improvements are due changes in data collection and clearer expectations, and don't necessarily indicate improved student learning.
  - If there is anything you would like to clarify in that regard we will be happy to send the report back to you for revision so that we can perhaps change the rating.
  - Zack's notes 11/16/16
  - After going back and rereading the report I have given credit for rubric item #8 and have raised the rating to 5-Exemplary.
  - In Measure 2.1 at first I was hesitant because the improvement in scores is accredited to collecting data from just MMC 4411 rather than MMC 4411 and



ADV 4101, clarifying rubrics, discussion of rigor, better explaining of project expectations, and emphasizing group dynamics and its importance to the course and professional development. Upon first reading I was thinking that some of those things are really just changes to collect better data, and that the new data collection was probably the main reason for the increased scores. I didn't think it really indicated that student knowledge improved. But, after rereading it I remember that we encourage outcomes to assess what we want our students to Do, Know, and VALUE. On the second read I began to see this more as a "Value" measure and realize that by emphasizing the importance of group dynamics and the importance of rigor, students likely learned the value of hard work and being a good team member, and that some of the improvement probably results from that.