

UCF Assessment

Archives - Plan Review

Assessment Tips

Program/Unit: ▼

2017-2018 Plan Review 2016-2017 Plan Review 2015-2016 Plan Review 2014-2015 Plan Review 2013-2014 Plan Review 2012-2013 Plan Review

Mission:

What is the primary purpose and functions of the program/unit? Who are the stakeholders?

The Human Communication Major in the Nicholson School of Communication is dedicated to serving its students, the Central Florida community, and the professions associated with the field of communication. The mission of the program is to offer high-quality, academically challenging undergraduate education to equip students with discipline specific knowledge, critical thinking ability, and communication skills necessary to pursuing their academic and professional goals; to provide the program's students with the educational development that will enhance the intellectual, cultural, environmental, and economic development of the metropolitan region; to develop students' academic and professional competencies; to establish UCF as a major presence in local and global communication related professional and academic communities; and to, thereby, support the mission and vision of the University of Central Florida as a whole.

Assessment Process:

Who is conducting the assessment? What are they doing? What do you want to assess (what are your outcomes)? How do you plan to assess it (strategies, tools, measures)? How will you review and analyze the data? How are you going to use the assessment results to improve your program/unit? How will you communicate the results to other faculty or staff members?

Several years ago we underwent a review and revision of our Program Learning Outcomes. The Program Learning Outcomes listed below, are the product of that process. We feel these outcomes more accurately reflect the multi-theoretical nature of our discipline and support the inherent practical implications of human communication. Faculty have identified elements of individual courses that should have an impact on each Program Learning Outcome, which has allowed us to move to embedded assessment items rather than the separate measures we had employed previously. These Program Learning Objectives were used for the first time for the AY2010-2011 assessment. Although there were some difficulties in the data collection process the results were usable as a starting point. Data collection in subsequent years has steadily progressed, however there is still room for improvement and refinement.

The Program Assessment for Human Communication is accomplished primarily through imbedded assessments in the various core and elective courses. The core courses include Spc3301 – Interpersonal Communication, Com3120 - Organizational Communication, and Com3311 - Communication Research Methods. These three core courses have been assessed in previous years. As of the last catalog, however, a curriculum change has gone into effect allowing students to take either the previously offered Com3011 - Communication and Human Relations, or a new course, Com3003 - Exploring Human Communication. Since Com3003 has never been assessed, the Human Communication faculty chose to include it in the upcoming assessment, instead of Com3011. The elective courses for the upcoming assessment include Com3013 – Communication and the Family, Com3022 - Health Communication, Com3110 - Business & Professional Communication, Com4014 - Gender Communication, Com4461 – Intercultural Communication, Spc4540 – Persuasion. The specific items for embedding are identified by faculty in accordance with the established Course Learning Objectives. Most of these items are exam questions, but written assignments, oral presentations, and other evidence of student learning may also be included in the embedded items. In addition to embedded items, we will continue to utilize several items from the Graduating Senior Survey designed to assess students' evaluations of the Program's success in developing their communication knowledge and skills.

The year before last marked the second assessment report based on a calendar year (2014) cycle, which was adopted by all the Nicholson School of Communication programs. This transition revealed some difficulties as well, but we feel that the calendar year system will ultimately improve our data collection and increase our faculty involvement. The present plan is for calendar year 2016.

Relationship to Strategic Plan:

How are one or more of the outcomes or measures linked to the UCF Collective Impact Strategic Plan (i.e., please see sections that identify granular metrics and supporting strategies). In addition, you may link to supporting strategic plans at any subordinate level. Describe in explicit terms the alignment with strategic planning. You can find the UCF Collective Impact Strategic Plan through the hyperlink above or by going to the assessment login page under 'Related UCF Links,' click on 'Strategic Plan.'

Outcomes 1 through 6 are all related to the strategic goal aimed at offering the best undergraduate education in the state, assessing student knowledge of literature in the field and methods of inquiry.

Outcomes 7 and 8 deal specifically with the assesement our Human Communication students' ability to effectively communicate, orally and in writing, as annunciated in the strategic outcome of producing an educated citizenry.

Mission, Process & Strategic Plan Comments:

Please consider the

This is clear and concise. PS 1/17/17

- Zack's notes 3/8/17
- Mission: Good.
- Assessment Process: Good. I might offer just one piece of advice that I offer to all assessment coordinators. Be sure to address all of the prompt questions in blue text. I am not saying you haven't done this. When I write my own plans I sometimes even go so far as to use bullets and answer each one by one. That way I make sure I've addressed everything, and it makes it easy for readers to see that I've addressed everything and for them to find precisely what they might be looking for. Just some food for thought.
- Relationship to Strategic Planning: This is satisfactory... Just a heads-up, with the new UCF strategic initiatives document that was released this past year it is likely that we will soon be asked to dig deeper beyond the 5 main goals of the university and look into deeper strategies within the plan and connect our assessments to those. just so you're aware that this may be coming.

following:

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

☐ Revision or explanation needed

☒ Satisfactory

Top

Outcome: 1

Students will be able to demonstrate understanding of constructs, terminology, and historical influences applicable to communication in various contexts.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

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

Measure: 1.1

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions (mid-term and/or final exams) assessing their understanding of the constructs, terminology, and historical influences in the context of Interpersonal Communication (SPC-3011).

Note: As we have noted in our last several reports, when collecting data from embedded questions it is not feasible to calculate results in a "X % will score at least X %" format. Thus, in subsequent years we have reported data as aggregated percentages of correct responses. We feel the benefits of using authentic, embedded data outweigh this shortcoming.

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:

The Human Communication faculty decided to focus on changes to Measure 8 this year.

Measure: 1.2

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions (mid-term and/or final exams) assessing their understanding of the constructs, terminology, and historical influences in the context of Organizational Communication (COM-3120).

[See note under Measure 1.1]

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

- ☐ Yes
☒ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:

The Human Communication faculty decided to focus on changes to Measure 8 this year.

Measure: 1.3

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions (mid-term and/or final exams) assessing their understanding of the constructs, terminology, and historical influences in the context of Exploring Human Communication (COM-3003) .

[See note under Measure 1.1]

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

- ☐ Yes
☒ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:

a) The Human Communication faculty decided to focus on changes to Measure 8 this year. b) This measure was changed for calendar year 2015.

Outcome & Measures Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Outcome & Measures Comment:

Many departments have used some version of the "80% of students will answer 80% correctly" measure and you are right, it is ungainly, cumbersome, and extremely difficult to quantify in a reasonable amount of time. Your assessment should be more robust with measures that can actually be tallied. PS 1/17/17

- Zack's notes 3/8/17
- Outcome 1: The outcome statement is good.
- Measure 1.1: the measure statement is good.
- Measure 1.2: the measure statement is good.
- Measure 1.3: the measure statement is good.
 - In the future for all three measures I might just suggest saying "The average score of all students will be 80%" or something like that, instead of saying "Students will correctly answer 80% of the embedded questions." From the latter, one might infer that that means EVERY student will score 80% or better, when really it is intended to mean that the mean score will be 80%. It is well explained in the explanation in measure 1.1, but it might be better to clearly state it up front, and then you wouldn't even need the disclaimer to further explain it. Just something to consider.
- Attachments: Attachments look good. Just one thing to double check the measure says SPC 3011, but the attachment says SPC 3301. Is this a typo, or a different course? For future plans please just double check for accuracy.

Attachments: HC_2016_PLO1-1.docx HC_2016_PLO1-2.docx HC_2016_PLO1-3.docx HumCom_PgmObjectives_v05.pdf

Top

Outcome: 2

Students will be able to demonstrate understanding of theories, models, and principles that apply to communication in

various contexts.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

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

Measure: 2.1

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions (mid-term and/or final exams) assessing their understanding of the theories, models, and principles that apply to Interpersonal Communication (SPC-3301).

[See note under Measure 1.1]

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:

The Human Communication faculty decided to focus on changes to Measure 8 this year.

Measure: 2.2

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions (mid-term and/or final exams) assessing their understanding of the theories, models, and principles that apply to Organizational Communication (COM-3120).

[See note under Measure 1.1]

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:

The Human Communication faculty decided to focus on changes to Measure 8 this year.

Measure: 2.3

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions (mid-term and/or final exams) assessing their understanding of the theories, models, and principles that apply to Exploring Human Communication (COM-3003).

[See note under Measure 1.1]

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

- ☐ Yes
☒ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:

a) The Human Communication faculty decided to focus on changes to Measure 8 this year. b) This measure was changed for calendar year 2015.

Outcome & Measures Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Outcome & Measures Comment:

It is appropriate to give the measuring tools you revised in 2015 more time to generate useful data before implementing addition changes. PS 1/17/17

- Zack's notes 3/9/17
- Outcome 2: looks good.
- Measure 2.1: good.
- Measure 2.2: good.
- Measure 2.3: good.
 - As with outcome 1 for all three measures perhaps just consider rewording slightly to make it very clear up front the target is the average overall score of all students.
- Attachments:
 - I was unable to open the first attachment. Please double check it to make sure it is attache properly.
 - The others seem appropriate.

Attachments: HumCom_PgmObjectives_v05.pdf HC_2016_PLO2-1.docx HC_2016_PLO2-2.docx HC_2016_PLO2-3.docx

Top

Outcome: 3

Students will be able to apply theory-based communication strategies in various contexts.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

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

Measure: 3.1

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions (mid-term and/or final exams) assessing their ability to apply theory-based communication strategies in the context of Interpersonal Communication (SPC-3301).

[See note under Measure 1.1]

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

- ☐ Yes
☒ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not

do so:

The Human Communication faculty decided to focus on changes to Measure 8 this year.

Measure: 3.2

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions (mid-term and/or final exams) assessing their ability to apply theory-based communication strategies in the context of Organizational Communication (COM-3120).

[See note under Measure 1.1]

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

- ☐ Yes
☒ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:

The Human Communication faculty decided to focus on changes to Measure 8 this year.

Measure: 3.3

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions (mid-term and/or final exams) assessing their ability to apply theory-based communication strategies in the context of Exploring Human Communication (COM-3003).

[See note under Measure 1.1]

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

- ☐ Yes
☒ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:

a) The Human Communication faculty decided to focus on changes to Measure 8 this year. b) This measure was changed for calendar year 2015.

Outcome & Measures Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Outcome & Measures Comment:

Satisfactory. PS 1/17/17

- Zack's notes 3/9/17
- Outcome 3: outcome statement looks good.
- Measures: Same notes as previous outcomes.
- Attachments appear to be appropriate.

Attachments: HC_2016_PLO3-1.docx HC_2016_PLO3-2.docx HC_2016_PLO3-3.docx HumCom_PgmObjectives_v05.pdf

Top

Outcome: 4

Students will be able to demonstrate understanding of the processes by which social-scientific knowledge about human

communication is generated.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

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

Measure: 4.1

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

Communication Research Methods (COM-3311) students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions (mid-term and/or final exams) assessing their ability to identify and understand various research methods used in Communication research.

[See note under Measure 1.1]

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:

The Human Communication faculty decided to focus on changes to Measure 8 this year.

Measure: 4.2

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

Communication Research Methods (COM-3311) students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions (mid-term and/or final exams) assessing their ability to identify and understand measurement and sampling techniques used in Communication research.

[See note under Measure 1.1]

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:

The Human Communication faculty decided to focus on changes to Measure 8 this year.

Measure: 4.3

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

Communication Research Methods (COM-3311) students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions (mid-term and/or final exams) assessing their ability to identify and understand Identify and understand quantitative and qualitative data analysis as used in Communication research.

[See note under Measure 1.1]

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

- ☐ Yes
☒ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:

The Human Communication faculty decided to focus on changes to Measure 8 this year.

Outcome & Measures Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Outcome & Measures Comment:

Satisfactory. PS 1/17/17

- Zack's notes 3/9/17
- outcome and measures look good. Just the same considerations as previous measures. attachments look good as well.

Attachments: HumCom_PgmObjectives_v05.pdf HC_2016_PLO4-1-3.docx

Top

Outcome: 5

Students will be able to recognize communication behaviors necessary to effectively communicate in a diverse society.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

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

Measure: 5.1

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions (mid-term and/or final exams) assessing their ability to recognize communication behaviors necessary to effectively communicate in a diverse society from the perspective of COM-4461 Intercultural Communication (or another restricted elective course).

[See note under Measure 1.1]

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

- ☐ Yes
☒ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:

The Human Communication faculty decided to focus on changes to Measure 8 this year.

Measure: 5.2

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test

that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions (mid-term and/or final exams) assessing their ability to recognize communication behaviors necessary to effectively communicate in a diverse society from the perspective of COM-4014 Gender Issues in Communication (or another restricted elective course).

[See note under Measure 1.1]

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

- ☐ Yes
☒ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:

The Human Communication faculty decided to focus on changes to Measure 8 this year.

Measure: 5.3

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions (mid-term and/or final exams) assessing their ability to recognize communication behaviors necessary to effectively communicate in a diverse society from the perspective of COM-3110 Business and Professional Communication (or another restricted elective course).

[See note under Measure 1.1]

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

- ☐ Yes
☒ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:

The Human Communication faculty decided to focus on changes to Measure 8 this year.

Outcome & Measures Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Outcome & Measures Comment:

Satisfactory. PS 1/17/17

- Zack's notes 3/8/17
- outcome, measures, and attachments all seem appropriate. Consider same suggestions as previous measures.

Attachments: HC_2016_PLO5-1.docx HC_2016_PLO5-2.docx HC_2016_PLO5-3.docx HumCom_PgmObjectives_v05.pdf

Top

Outcome: 6

Students will be able to demonstrate critical thinking in the formulation of context-specific messages and by applying theoretical concepts to practical situations.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

- ☐ Communication
☒ Critical Thinking

- ☐ Discipline-specific knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors
- ☐ Not an ALC

Measure: 6.1

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions (mid-term and/or final exams) assessing their ability to demonstrate critical thinking in the formulation of context-specific messages or the application of theoretical concepts to practical situations in the context of COM-3013 Communication in the Family (or another restricted elective course).

[See note under Measure 1.1]

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:

The Human Communication faculty decided to focus on changes to Measure 8 this year.

Measure: 6.2

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions (mid-term and/or final exams) assessing their ability to demonstrate critical thinking in the formulation of context-specific messages or the application of theoretical concepts to practical situations in the context of COM-3022 Health Communication (or another restricted elective course).

[See note under Measure 1.1]

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:

The Human Communication faculty decided to focus on changes to Measure 8 this year.

Measure: 6.3

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions (mid-term and/or final exams) assessing their ability to demonstrate critical thinking in the formulation of context-specific messages or the application of theoretical concepts to practical situations in the context of SPC-4540 Persuasion (or another restricted elective course).

[See note under Measure 1.1]

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:

The Human Communication faculty decided to focus on changes to Measure 8 this year.

Outcome & Measures Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Outcome & Measures Comment:

The different courses mentioned in each measure 6.1-63 are each restricted elective courses, correct? PS 1/17/17

- Zack's notes 3/9/17
- outcome, measures and attachments are good. consider same suggestions as previous measures.

Attachments: HumCom_PgmObjectives_v05.pdf HC_2016_PLO6-1.docx HC_2016_PLO6-2.docx HC_2016_PLO6-3.docx

Top

Outcome: 7

Graduating Human Communication students will be competent communicators (public speaking/communicating in small groups).

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

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

Measure: 7.1

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

At least 80% of the respondents to the Graduating Senior Survey will report that the Program has developed their competence as a speaker at satisfactory or above satisfactory levels.

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:

The Human Communication faculty decided to focus on changes to Measure 8 this year.

Measure: 7.2

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

At least 80% of the respondents to the Graduating Senior Survey report that the Program has developed their competence "communicating in small group settings" at satisfactory or above satisfactory levels.

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit

performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

- ☐ Yes
☒ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:

The Human Communication faculty decided to focus on changes to Measure 8 this year.

Measure: 7.3

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

Students in COM-3110 Business and Professional Communication are required to make two oral presentations. For the second presentation, it is expected that 85% of all students will score "Effective" or "Very Effective" according to the attached evaluation rubric.

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

- ☐ Yes
☒ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:

This measure was used for the first time in last year's assessment. Data from last year and the upcoming year will be analyzed to determine the efficacy of last year's change.

Outcome & Measures Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Outcome & Measures Comment:

Please make sure that you "close the loop" in the next cycle's assessment review with the forthcoming data generated by Measure 7.3 to earn a higher assessment score! PS 1/17/17

- Zack's notes 3/9/17
- outcome, measures are good.
- Attachments:
 - I was unable to open the first attachment.
 - If possible the survey should be attached, or just the questions asked of these measure, or an explanation provided as to why the surveys cannot be attached.

Attachments: HC_2016_PLO7-3.docx GSS_HumanComm_2016.pdf HumCom_PgmObjectives_v05.pdf

Top

Outcome: 8

Students will be able to demonstrate ability to write effectively in a scholarly context.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

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

Measure: 8.1

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

At least 80% of the respondents to the Graduating Senior Survey will report that the Program has developed their competence as a writer at satisfactory or above satisfactory levels.

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

- ☐ Yes
☒ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:

We are focusing on Measure 8.2 (below). We believe, however, that this item (8.1) used in conjunction with the revised item 8.2 will provide us a much better picture of our students' writing skills.

Measure: 8.2

Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

At least 75% of participating students will achieve a rating of above satisfactory (or better) on the diagnostic writing sample.

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

Specify prior year's results:

Human Communication - B.A.

- | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1.1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2.2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3.3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5.1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6.2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7.3 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1.2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2.3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4.1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5.2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6.3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 8.1 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1.3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3.1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4.2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5.3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 8.2 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2.1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3.2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4.3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6.1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7.2 | |

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:

For the upcoming assessment, we will be designing and testing a writing intervention. Our next dataset will provide the first feedback on the efficacy of that intervention. Although this process has taken far longer than we originally anticipated, we are encouraged that we will soon start the loop-closing process with regard to student writing.

Outcome & Measures Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Outcome & Measures Comment:

This seems like an excellent change. Adding a more quantitative and objective measure to support the results of the student survey in measure 8.1 is a clear improvement that will generate more diverse and robust data. PS 1/17/17

- Zack's notes 3/9/17
- outcome 8: outcome statement looks fine
- measure 8.1: looks good.
- Measure 8.2: We need to know more about the diagnostic writing sample. What is it? How is it evaluated? Please provide more explanation to this measure.
 - For example: "Students in ____ course are required to complete a series of writing assignments. They then select X number of these writing assignments to be included in a portfolio diagnostic writing sample. These samples are evaluated by a panel of 3 faculty members. It is expected that on average students will receive a 75% on the evaluation rubric."
 - I am not completely clear on what the change is. I know it is a writing intervention, but what does that mean? When discussing a change we want to know three things 1) What change is being made? 2) Why is it being made? 3) How is it expected to improve the results for this measure?
 - Example: "We are adding a writing intervention into the program to help improve student writing. Previously, we just collected writing samples from students at the end of the program for evaluation. We will now be reviewing writing samples from students after their third year in the program to give them

feedback on how to improve prior to their final submission of a writing sample at the end of the program. We are implementing this intervention because we have been just above our 75% target in previous years and we believe we can bring that number up. We expect that providing students with some feedback on their writing part way through the program will help them correct some of the areas of weakness resulting in stronger final samples being submitted at the end of the program."

- Attachments:
 - As with previous outcomes I am unable to open the HumCom PgmObjectives attachment.
 - the rubric attachment is good.
 -

Attachments: HumCom_PgmObjectives_v05.pdf Rubric_Writing_Item8-2[2016].docx GSS_HumanComm_2016.pdf

Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Plan Rubric

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

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

Indicators:

- ☒ 1. Mission statement describes the primary purpose, functions, and stakeholders of the program/unit.

The mission statement should be specific to the program or unit.

- ☒ 2. Assessment process describes the program or unit's assessment strategy; how that strategy is translated into outcomes and measures; and the process for reviewing, analyzing, and applying assessment data for program/unit improvement.

The assessment process statement should paint a clear picture of all major aspects of the program or unit's Institutional Effectiveness Assessment process. This may include a description of how the plan evolves over time and how it produces continuous quality improvement for the program or unit. This narrative should be written for "external" reviewers so that someone not familiar with the program or unit will, after reading this statement, have a good understanding of how the program or unit pursues data-driven continuous quality improvement.

- ☒ 3. Number of outcomes:

- Administrative units: minimum of three outcomes
- Graduate academic programs: minimum of three student learning outcomes
- Undergraduate academic programs: minimum of eight student learning outcomes that incorporate academic learning compacts

For academic programs, course grades and/or GPA may NOT be used as the metric for a measure.

- ☒ 4. Number and type of measures: For the required outcomes per indicator #3 above, a minimum of two appropriate, quantitative measures, at least one of which is a direct measure.

What constitutes a "direct measure" is contextually dependent. For academic program plans, a "direct measure" is typically assessment of student learning, while a survey of students' self-perceived efficacy would be considered an indirect measure. For an administrative unit measuring customer satisfaction, a survey instrument could be a direct measure.

- ☒ 5. Measures for the outcomes that meet the minimum requirements listed in indicator #3 establish specific performance targets.

For those outcomes and measures that satisfy the minimum requirements (per Indicators 3 and 4) each measure should identify a quantitative variable and establish a specific target outcome. This requirement does not apply to any additional outcomes/measures (beyond the minimum requirements) that a program or unit includes in its plan.

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

Assessment instruments (unless proprietary) should be submitted along with the plan either as attachments or links to online instruments. In the event an instrument is still in development when the plan is submitted, a brief description of the planned instrument along with a timeline for implementation may be attached. When this occurs, the program or unit should attach the final instrument to the subsequent Results Report.

Additional Indicators:

- ☒ 7. The plan explicitly links one or more outcomes or measures to strategic planning.

Administrative units and academic programs should align one or more elements of an IE Assessment plan with the UCF Collective Impact Strategic Plan (i.e., please see sections that identify granular metrics and supporting strategies). In addition, you may link to supporting strategic plans at any subordinate level.

- ☒ 8. The plan clearly focuses on formative assessment to promote continuous quality improvement (e.g., establishes baseline data, sets stretch targets based on past performance, etc.).

IE Assessment is a formative process. The primary purpose is to collect data that will help identify opportunities for continuous quality improvement. This is best evidenced when baseline data reveal an opportunity for improvement and a "stretch" target is set accordingly. In general, when a target for a measure is 100% or when a measure is written to "maintain" a particular level of performance, it is unlikely that the measure has strong formative potential.

- ☒ 9. The plan builds on previous assessment by including at least one measure to assess the impact of an implemented change, demonstrating a "closed loop" IE Assessment process.

Collecting data that will be used to evaluate the impact of an implemented change is central to the IE Assessment process. Measures designed for this purpose are the means to close the IE Assessment loop.

Overall Comments on Outcomes and Measures:

These various measures seem to be working well for you as they are diverse and cover a comprehensive range across the curriculum. The recent changes made to outcome 2 (in 2015) and outcome 8 (this plan) will begin to produce data that can be used to fully close the loop, as you observed in your plan. I fully anticipate future assessment cycles from your department to achieve an exemplary rating once this data is collected and presented in an assessment cycle in the near future. PS 1/17/17

- Zack's comments 3/9/17
- Overall the plan is solid. There are some things that I think should be done though to make it even stronger. Please see the notes throughout the plan document for ways to improve the plan for next time.
- I believe the plan has shown enough to receive credit for all the necessary rubric items to receive a rating of 5-Exemplary. However, to be completely honest I was on the fence about giving credit for several of them. Specifically:
 - In both last year's review and this year's review I have asked for additional information about the diagnostic writing sample for measure 8.2
 - In both last year's review and this year's review reviewers commented about not being able to open the HumCom PgmObjectives attachment, and an attachment related to the surveys in outcome 7 and 8 were asked for.
 - For the change indicated for measure 8.2 I think the explanation is lacking some important information regarding what exactly the implemented change (writing intervention) entails, why the change is being implemented, and how it is expected to improve the results of the measure.
- Please review the comments throughout the plan to address these items and some other more minor suggestions for next year's plan, so that we will be able to rate the plan highly again next year.