

UCF Assessment

Assessment Plan and Results

Plan Year: Status: Results Approved for DRC Report
 Program/Unit: Last Updated: 11/9/2015 5:50:56 PM

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

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

View/Submit Results Review  2013-2014 Results Review

Program/Unit: Human Communication - B.A.	DRC: College of Sciences
Year: 2014-2015	DRC Chair: Elizabeth Grauerholz
Due Date: 09/23/2015	Coordinator(s): Kim Tuorto, Boyd Lindsley, James Katt
	Reviewer(s): David Gay

Quick Links:

Mission:

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:

Four 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. These courses include Spc3301 – Interpersonal Communication, Com3120 - Organizational Communication, Com3011 - Communication and Human Relations, Com3311 - Communication Research Methods, Com3013 – Communication and the Family,

Com4461 – Intercultural Communication, Com4462 – Conflict Communication, Spc4540 – Attitudes and Communication. 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.

Finally, this year marks the second assessment report based on a calendar year (2014) cycle that 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.

Relationship to Strategic Plan:

The Nicholson School of Communication plans to move to a calendar year assessment period, so our next report will include only one additional semester of data. We do not feel that new changes are warranted until we review our next assessment effort.

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

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions assessing their understanding of the constructs, terminology, and historical influences in the context of Interpersonal Communication.

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.

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 were collected during the assessment period from 170 students enrolled in Spc3301 (Interpersonal Communication). The students correctly answered 83.4% of embedded questions pertaining to demonstrating an understanding of constructs, terminology, and historical influences

applicable to communication in various contexts. This percentage meets the objective.

Note: As we noted in our 2010-11 and subsequent 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.

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:

Previous year was 75.6

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 1.2

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions assessing their understanding of the constructs, terminology, and historical influences in the context of Organizational Communication.

[See note under Measure 1.1]

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 were collected during the assessment period from 83 students enrolled in Com3120 (Organizational Communication). The students correctly answered 82.5% of the embedded questions pertaining to their understanding of the constructs, terminology, and historical influences in the context of Organizational Communication. This percentage exceeds the objective.

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:

Previous year was 79.3

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 1.3

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions assessing their understanding of the constructs, terminology, and historical influences in the context of Communication and Human Relations.

[See note under Measure 1.1]

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 were collected during the assessment period from 38 students enrolled in Com3011 (Communication and Human Relations). The students correctly answered 93.3% of the embedded questions pertaining to their understanding of the constructs, terminology, and historical influences in the context of Communication and Human Relations. This percentage exceeds the objective.

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:

Previous year was 79.3

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 have purposefully kept most of our measures the same since moving to the use of embedded, authentic items. We believe we have now established some normative data and the faculty will determine what areas to modify. Meanwhile, it is a positive reflection on the program and faculty to find that all aspects of Outcome 1 meet or exceed the objectives.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

It is worth noting that a 14% increase in Measure 1.3 is a significant improvement. DG 10/15/15

- Zack's notes 11/9/15
- For all three measures I'd like a little more information.... How many questions total are embedded? What assignments are they embedded in? Is it on the final exam, or across multiple exams, etc.
 - I can gather that information from the attachments, but a brief explanation in the results would be helpful. Or you could put it in the measure in the plan and then you wouldn't have to write/update it when something changes.
- For all three measures and reflective statement we'd like to see some analysis of the results.
 - Granular data where possible. Are there particular questions or areas for which students performed better than others? etc.
 - For 1.1 and 1.2 you are just a couple points above the target. What might the program do to improve on those numbers for the future?
 - You saw improvement in all 3 measures, 8%, 3%, 14% respectively. What may have caused that improvement? Was it something the program did intentionally to create improvement in these areas? Was it something that was done because past assessment results? Was it something else?... this information will help with "closing the loop"
- **Regarding the note about the target... It is fine to use average score of all students as the target. You don't need to justify doing that via the note... I would recommend rewording the measure slightly though to avoid any confusion.... Maybe say something like "The average combined score of all students will be 80% or better on embedded questions..." Just to be completely clear that the average is what is going to be reported.

Attachments: HumCom_PgmObjectives_v05.pdf SPC3301_2014_HumCom.docx
Com3120_2014_HumCom.docx Com3011_2014_HumCom.docx

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

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions assessing their understanding of the theories, models, and principles that apply to Interpersonal Communication.

[See note under Measure 1.1]

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 were collected during the assessment period from 170 students enrolled in Spc3301 (Interpersonal Communication). The students correctly answered 77.2% of embedded questions pertaining to demonstrating an understanding of the theories, models, and principles that apply to communication in various contexts. This percentage falls slightly short of the objective.

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's assessment for this measure was 79.3; this year's score of 77.2 is marginally lower (see reflection statement, below).

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 2.2

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions assessing their understanding of the theories, models, and principles that apply to Organizational Communication.

[See note under Measure 1.1]

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 were collected during the assessment period from 83 students enrolled in Com3120 (Organizational Communication). The students correctly answered 81.9% of the embedded questions pertaining to their understanding of the theories, models, and principles that apply to Organizational Communication. This percentage exceeds the objective.

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's assessment for this measure was 82.2, 3/10ths of a percent higher, but for all practical purposes, the same.

Review:

☐ Revision or explanation needed

☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 2.3

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions assessing their understanding of the theories, models, and principles that apply to Communication and Human Relations.

[See note under Measure 1.1]

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 were collected during the assessment period from 38 students enrolled in Com3011 (Communication and Human Relations). The students answered 78.8% of the embedded questions pertaining to their understanding of the theories, models, and principles that apply to Communication and Human Relations. This percentage falls slightly short of the objective.

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's assessment for this measure was 79.4, 6/10ths of a percent higher, but for all practical purposes, the same.

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).

Two of the three measures of Outcome 2 fall slightly short of the objectives. These results will be discussed among the faculty to determine what changes, if any, should be incorporated in future plans.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

You make a stronger statement for Measure 2.2. If the measure fell just short of the performance for last year, but (as you note) the percentage exceeds the objective and the goal is attained. This is still evidence of success.

However, since two of your measures fall short of the objective, discussions among the faculty who teach these courses should be helpful. Perhaps, there certain "questions" or areas that are stronger than others. DG 10/15/15

- Zack's notes 11/9/15
- Pretty much the same comments as outcome 1.
- For all three measures I'd like a little more information.... How many questions total are embedded? What assignments are they embedded in? Is it on the final exam, or across multiple exams, etc.
 - I can gather that information from the attachments, but a brief explanation in the results would be helpful. Or you could put it in the measure in the plan and then you wouldn't have to write/update it when something changes.
- For all three measures and reflective statement we'd like to see some analysis of the results.
 - Granular data where possible. Are there particular questions or areas for which students performed better than others? etc.
 - For 2.1 and 2.3 results were below target and slightly lower than last year... Is there anything that may have accounted for the decline? (could just be statistical fluctuation since the change is small but it should be commented on). More importantly what might the program do to improve and meet the target next year.... I know you say that the faculty will discuss this. You should include possible changes if able to help get the ball rolling and provide evidence for potentially closing the loop in the future... Even if the program hasn't decided for sure, any changes that are being considered can be talked about.
 - For 2.2 you are just a couple points above the target. What might the program do to improve on those numbers for the future?

Attachments: Com3011_2014_HumCom.docx Com3120_2014_HumCom.docx
SPC3301_2014_HumCom.docx HumCom_PgmObjectives_v05.pdf

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

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions assessing their ability to apply theory-based communication strategies in the context of Interpersonal Communication.

[See note under Measure 1.1]

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 were collected during the assessment period from 170 students enrolled in Spc3301 (Interpersonal Communication). The students correctly answered 80.2% of embedded questions pertaining to their ability to apply theory-based communication strategies in the context of Interpersonal Communication. This percentage meets the objective.

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's assessment for this measure was 80.8, 6/10ths of a percent higher, but for all practical purposes, the same.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 3.2

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions assessing their ability to apply theory-based communication strategies in the context of Organizational Communication.

[See note under Measure 1.1]

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 were collected during the assessment period from 83 students enrolled in Com3120 (Organizational Communication). The students correctly answered 88.0% of the embedded questions pertaining to their ability to apply theory-based communication strategies in the context of Organizational Communication. This percentage exceeds the objective.

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's assessment for this measure was 80.3; this year's score of 88.0 is substantially higher.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 3.3

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions assessing their ability to apply theory-based communication strategies in the context of Communication and Human Relations.

[See note under Measure 1.1]

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 were collected during the assessment period from 38 students enrolled in Com3011 (Communication and Human Relations). The students correctly answered 85.0% of the embedded questions pertaining to their ability to apply theory-based communication strategies in the context of Communication and Human Relations. This percentage exceeds the objective.

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's assessment for this measure was 80.1; this year's score of 85.0 suggests improvement.

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 objective was exceeded for each of the three measures. This reflects well on the program.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

I agree with the reflective statement. The objectives have been exceeded for each of these measures. These results indicate the program is performing well in this area. DG 10/15/15

- Zack's notes 11/9/15
- Similar Comments to Outcomes 1 & 2
- How many embedded questions? embedded in which assignments?
- Further analysis
 - Granular data. any particular questions or areas in which students are performing better or worse than others?
 - What may have caused declines or improvements compared to previous years?
 - What might the program do to create improvement in future cycles.

Attachments: HumCom_PgmObjectives_v05.pdf SPC3301_2014_HumCom.docx
Com3120_2014_HumCom.docx Com3011_2014_HumCom.docx

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

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions assessing their ability to identify and understand various research methods used in Communication research.

[See note under Measure 1.1]

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 were collected during the assessment period from 73 students enrolled in Com3311 (Communication Research Methods). The students correctly answered 85.6% of the embedded questions pertaining to their ability to identify and understand various research methods used in Communication research. This percentage exceeds the objective.

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's assessment for this measure was 79.8. This year's score of 85.6 suggests improved learning performance.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 4.2

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions assessing their ability to identify and understand measurement and sampling techniques used in Communication research.

[See note under Measure 1.1]

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 were collected during the assessment period from 73 students enrolled in Com3311 (Communication Research Methods). The students correctly answered 77.2% of the embedded questions pertaining to their ability to identify and understand measurement and sampling techniques used in Communication research. This percentage falls slightly short of the objective.

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's assessment for this measure produced an 81.1, almost 3 percent higher than this year's score of 77.2.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 4.3

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions 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]

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 were collected during the assessment period from 73 students enrolled in Com3311 (Communication Research Methods). The students correctly answered 81.0% of the embedded questions pertaining to their ability to identify and understand quantitative and qualitative data analysis as used in Communication research.

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's assessment for this measure was 78.9. This year's assessment is 2.1 percentage points higher (81.0%), but is for all practical purposes the same.

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 mean average (81.2%) of the three measures for Outcome 4 meets the objective. We feel these results are based on authentic data, the quality of which will only improve as we make adjustments to improve the data collections process.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

If the program is satisfied with the measures, then perhaps they should try to "dig down" a bit to see if there are any particular patterns that emerge on a question by question basis. DG10/15/15

- Zack's notes 11/9/15
- The reviewer makes a good point about examining disaggregate/granular data.
- Same comments as previous outcomes.
 - How many embedded questions? embedded in which assignments?
 - Granular data. any particular questions or areas in which students are performing better or worse than others?
 - What may have caused declines or improvements compared to previous years?
 - What might the program do to create improvement in future cycles.

Attachments: Com3311a_2014_HumCom.docx Com3311b_2014_HumCom.docx
 HumCom_PgmObjectives_v05.pdf

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

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

[See note under Measure 1.1]

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 were collected during the assessment period from 37 students enrolled in Com3022 (Health Communication). The students correctly answered 85.7% of the embedded questions pertaining to their ability to recognize communication behaviors necessary to effectively communicate in a diverse society from the perspective of Intercultural Communication. This percentage exceeds the objective.

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's assessment for this item was 83.3%. This year represents a slight improvement.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 5.2

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions assessing their ability to

recognize communication behaviors necessary to effectively communicate in a diverse society from the perspective of Gender Issues in Communication (or another restricted elective course).

[See note under Measure 1.1]

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 were collected during the assessment period from 39 students enrolled in Com4014 (Gender Issues in Communication). Students scored 82.0% on embedded questions pertaining to their ability to recognize communication behaviors necessary to effectively communicate in a diverse society. This percentage exceeds the objective.

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's assessment for this measure was 83.7, 1.7 percentage points higher, but for all practical purposes, the same.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 5.3

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

[See note under Measure 1.1]

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 were collected during the assessment period from 29 students enrolled in Com3110 (Business & Professional Communication). The students correctly answered 73.3% of the embedded questions pertaining to their ability to recognize communication behaviors necessary to effectively communicate in a diverse society. This percentage is well below the objective.

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 years assessment on this measure was 81.2, nearly 8 percentage points higher than this year (see reflective statement below).

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).

Two of the three measures exceeded the objective. The third fell short; these results will be discussed among the faculty to determine what changes, if any, should be incorporated in future plans.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

An 8% decrease is a significant drop. You may want to look at the instrument or analyze more granular data to locate the decrease. DG 10/15/15

- Zack's notes 11/9/15
- Same comments as previous outcomes.
- How many embedded questions? embedded in which assignments?
- Further analysis
 - Granular data any particular questions or areas in which students are performing better or worse than others?
 - What may have caused declines or improvements compared to previous years?
 - What might the program do to create improvement in future cycles.

Attachments: HumCom_PgmObjectives_v05.pdf Com4014_2014_HumCom.docx
SPC3022b_2014_HumCom.docx Com3110_2014_HumCom.docx

[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

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions 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 Argumentation and Debate (or another restricted elective course).

[See note under Measure 1.1]

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 were collected during the assessment period from 49 students enrolled in Spc4540 (Persuasion). The students answered 82.7% of the embedded questions pertaining to 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 Attitudes and Communication. This percentage exceeds the objective.

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's assessment for this measure was 83.4, 7/10ths of a percent higher, but for all practical purposes, the same.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 6.2

Students will correctly answer 80% or more of the embedded questions 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 Motivation in Communication (or another restricted elective course).

[See note under Measure 1.1]

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 were collected during the assessment period from 27 students enrolled in Com4462 (Conflict Management). The students answered 78.8% of the embedded questions pertaining to 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 Conflict Management. This percentage falls slightly short of the objective.

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's assessment on this measure was 83.2, over 4 percentage points higher than this year (see reflective statement below)

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 6.3

Students will correctly answer 75% or more of the embedded questions 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 Communication in the Family (or another restricted elective course).

[See note under Measure 1.1]

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 were collected during the assessment period from 37 students enrolled in Com3022 (Health Communication). Students correctly answered 85.7% of embedded questions pertaining to 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 Health Communication. This percentage exceeds the objective.

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's assessment for this measure was 83.2, which was 2.5 percentage points lower than this 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).

One of the three measures of Outcome 6 falls slightly short of the objective. These results will be discussed among the faculty to determine what changes, if any, should be incorporated in future plans.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Again, the measures for outcome 6 appear very similar to the pattern of other outcomes. That is, some are higher the previous year, some are about the same, and one (usually) falls short of the

objective. To a certain extent, you are getting consistent results. DG 10/15/15

- Zack's notes 11/9/15
- Same comments as previous outcomes.
- How many embedded questions? embedded in which assignments?
- Further analysis
 - Granular data. any particular questions or areas in which students are performing better or worse than others?
 - What may have caused declines or improvements compared to previous years?
 - What might the program do to create improvement in future cycles.
- Additionally, for 6.3 the target is 75% and you've been at 83% and 85% the past 2 years. You may want to consider setting a stretch target, raising the bar to 80% or 85%.

Attachments: Spc4540_2014_HumCom.docx SPC3022a_2014_HumCom.docx
HumCom_PgmObjectives_v05.pdf Com4462_2014_HumCom.docx

Top

Outcome: 7

Graduating students will be perceive the Human Communication program has helped them become a more competent communicator (speaker/listener).

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

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

Measure: 7.1

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.

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

The Graduating Senior Survey on oral competence was operationalized with a 4-interval Likert-type scale. Of 239 graduating seniors who responded to the item, 85.5% agreed or strongly agreed that the program "developed your competence as a speaker." This exceeds the objective.

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:

Results are the same. Due to our calendar-year assessment cycle, we have been using the most recent GSS academic year data available. For our last assessment report that was GSS for ay13-14. At this time, GSS for ay14-15 is not yet available, so ay13-14 is (again) the most recent.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 7.2

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.

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

The Graduating Senior Survey on oral competence was operationalized with a 4-interval Likert-type scale. Of 238 graduating seniors who responded to the item, 92.6% agreed or strongly agreed that the program developed my competence "communicating in small group settings." This exceeds the objective.

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:

Results were the same (see explanation 7.1, above).

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).

According to the existing measures, the program does very well with regard to helping students become more competent communicators. Given our discipline, we would expect our student to fare well on this objective. We are looking for ways to create authentic, embedded assessments for this objective, which will be used in addition to the GSS data.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Measures for this outcome exhibit a similar pattern. The program appears to meet most of their goals. DG 10/15/15

- Zack's notes 11/9/15
- We want to see the granular/disaggregate data as well as the overall... How many strongly agreed, how many agreed, how many disagreed, etc.?
- Is there any method for you to collect data for those who did not agree as to why they did not agree? narrative/comments response sections on the survey could provide you with valuable information for ways to improve.
- ** In regard to the plan - I like your comment about adding an embedded questions measure to this outcome.... For assessment each Outcome must include at least 1 "Direct Measure" ... self-perception based measures such as surveys are "Indirect Measures"... you must include a direct measure with this outcome that evaluates student communication skills via an assignment or instructor observation or something of that nature.

Attachments: HumCom_PgmObjectives_v05.pdf GraduatingSeniorSurveyResults_ay13-14.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

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.

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

The Graduating Senior Survey on oral competence was operationalized with a 4-interval Likert-type scale. Of 240 graduating seniors who responded to the item, 83.6% agreed or strongly agreed that the program "developed my competence as a writer." This meets the objective.

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:

Results were the same (see explanation 7.1, above).

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 8.2

At least 75% of participating students will achieve a rating of above satisfactory (or better) on the diagnostic essay administered in SPC3301 Interpersonal Communication.

Note: We did not use this measure in AY2012-13, opting instead to undergo a diagnostic assessment of student writing (see AY2012-13 results/reflective stmt). Based on that results of the diagnostic assessment the faculty decided to change measure 8.2 to focus on the difficiencies revealed. At that time, we intended to implement the new measure for the AY2013-14 assessment. Subsequently, however, the decision was made by the Nicholson School of Communication to move to a calendar year assessment period. The result of this move is that the plan described herein will include only one additional semester of data. Given this reality, we now intend to implement the new 8.2 measure during the current assessment period - calendar year 2014.

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

Results from 35 students were assessed based an embedded writing assignment for Com3022 (Health Communication). The assessment rubric was directed at writing skills. 80.0% were "Excellent" or "Acceptable." This outcome meets the objective.

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's assessment for this measure was 84.5. While this year's result is 4.5 pts lower, it may be may more accurately reflect the reality of our students' writing ability (also see reflective statement below).

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).

From these data, it appears that our students' writing meets the expectations of the learning objective. Prior to last year, we relied only on GSS data to assess writing competence. We intended to include a diagnostic essay during the FA14 semester, but failed to bring that goal to fruition. It remains on the "to do" list for the future. We believe that this process will eventually provide a richer picture of our students' level writing competence and guide us in making instructional adjustments to help them become more competent and confident writers.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Additional data will bring stronger conclusions. Throughout the report, reflective statements indicate future discussions among the faculty concerning measurements. This seems like a reasonable way to proceed. You also may want to get specific data in your senior surveys to find out what issues gave them the most problems. However, you are exceeding your objectives on the majority of items. DG 10/15/15

- Zack's notes 11/9/15
- For 8.1 same comments as outcome 7...
 - we want to see the granular/disaggregate data. How many agreed, disagreed, etc.
 - If you can include a comments/narrative question where students can provide feedback it could provide the program with useful information as to why students disagree which could lead the program to make changes to create improvement "closing the loop"
- For 8.2
 - Again here we want to see the granular/disaggregate data. How many score excellent, acceptable, etc.?
 - We'd also like to see the rubric. I don't know if the "pgmobjectives" attachment contains it. I was not able to open it... We want to know what the scale is (excellent, acceptable, to what?) We also want to know what constitutes a score of "excellent" etc.
- Same comments as other outcomes in regard to what might the program do to create improvement. What may have caused the results you obtained this cycle? etc.

- Some nice comments about including a diagnostic essay... These are good changes to the assessment process for collecting better data.... throughout we also want to see discussion of changes to curriculum, pedagogy, etc. that will create or have created improvements in student performance.

Attachments: GraduatingSeniorSurveyResults_ay13-14.pdf HumCom_PgmObjectives_v05.pdf

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:

Data was gathered primarily from embedded exam questions. GSS results were also utilized for objectives 7 & 8.

Examinations/Tests:

Standardized:

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

Explain EACH item checked above:

n/a

Local:

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

Explain EACH item checked above:

Embed questions in course examinations.

Surveys:

Institution (UCF):

- ☒ UCF Graduating Student Survey

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Review Comments:

Assessment methods appear thorough and relevant. You may want to ask senior students about some of the embedded questions. That is, are there any aspects of the measures that they find difficult. This could useful information for faculty discussions. For example, perhaps members of the faculty could meet with a focus group of students. Just something to think about. DG 10/15/15

- Zack's notes 11/9/15
- all the methods are identified. Consider providing a little more for the explanations... As I mentioned throughout the outcomes, with the embedded questions I want to know how many questions, what assignments etc. ... A little of that here would be nice. I typically also like to see the measures that each method is tied to listed, in this case it pretty much all measures for the embedded questions so that is not as relevant here but may be worth doing anyway in the future.
- I do have some moderate concern that the same assessment method is being used for nearly all measures (and less concerning is that many of the same courses are used for multiple measures). In the future you might consider adding more diversity to the methods... for example in outcome 1 you have 3 measures all using embedded questions. You could combine the scores of the embedded questions from the 3 courses into a single measure 1.1 (reporting the individual course scores as granular/disaggregate data) and then choose a totally different assignment/method for measure 1.2.... This might give the program another perspective for how well students are learning for that particular outcome and give the program new ideas for ways to improve.

(Seniors or Graduate student)

- ☐ Alumni Survey
- ☐ Student Satisfaction Survey
- ☐ First Destination Survey
- ☐ Employee Survey
- ☐ Entering Student Survey

Explain EACH item checked above:

see objectives 7 & 8

Local:

- ☒ Alumni Survey (Department or Program; not UCF)
- ☒ Customer Satisfaction Survey
- ☒ Exit and Other Interviews

Explain EACH item checked above:

n/a

Other Survey(s):

- ☐ National Survey
- ☐ State Survey
- ☒ Other Survey

Explain EACH item checked above:

n/a

Miscellaneous Assessment Methods:

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

Explain EACH item checked above:

n/a

Changes to Academic Process:

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

Criteria:

Please comment on implemented and planned changes

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

Review:

- ☐ 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.

Nothing in our data suggests that our academic process is problematic.

Changes to Curriculum:

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

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

Nothing in our data suggests that our curriculum is problematic.

Changes to Assessment Plan:

- ☐ Revise Student Outcome Statement
- ☐ Revise Measurement Approach
- ☐ Collect and Analyze Additional Data and Information
- ☒ Change Method of Data Collection

Is this an implemented or planned change?

- ☐ Implemented Change
- ☒ Planned Change
- ☐ Both

Planned change for next assessment cycle:

The information you see below has been taken from your own plan and results for the current assessment cycle. This means you must complete the results and reflective statement in

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Review Comments:

The program appears to have a clear vision for continuation and improvement. DG 10/15/15

- Zack's notes 11/6/15
- For changes to academic process and curriculum it is not a matter of whether anything you are doing is problematic... Assessment isn't about showing how well we are doing, it is about continuous improvement. Whether or not we are meeting our targets doesn't matter as much as whether or not we are making efforts to improve. If you are meeting targets there is still room for improvement and the program should still look for ways to get better. If you are meeting the target consistently you should raise the bar setting stretch targets and making changes to meet the new target. If you are not meeting targets you should be making changes to try to improve student learning to meet the targets.
- The planned change of adding the diagnostic essay is a great change to the assessment plan for collecting better data and shows that you are paying attention to assessment and making efforts to improve the process... In order for you to "close the loop" in the future though, you will have to start using assessment results to find areas of student performance that can be improved, and make changes that will potentially improve student learning/performance.
- Lastly, in outcome 7 you talk about adding embedded questions as a measure (this or something similar will have to be done to give outcome 7 a direct measure) This could also go in this section as a planned change.

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: 8 Measure: 1

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

From these data, it appears that our students' writing meets the expectations of the learning objective. Prior to last year, we relied only on GSS data to assess writing competence. We intended to include a diagnostic essay during the FA14 semester, but failed to bring that goal to fruition. It remains on the "to do" list for the future. We believe that this process will eventually provide a richer picture of our students' level writing competence and guide us in making instructional adjustments to help them become more competent and confident writers.

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

The faculty will meet to decide the appropriate measures and data collection procedures for the diagnostic essay. The revised plan for Objective 8.1 will be included in the upcoming assessment plan.

- ☐ Other implemented or planned change(s)
- ☐ Plan has been reviewed and no changes made
- ☐ No Changes to Assessment Plan

Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Results Rubric

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

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

Indicators:

- ☒ 1. Complete and relevant data are provided for all measures and an explanation is provided for how representative samples are determined, if applicable. If data are incomplete or missing, provide an explanation of the extenuating circumstances. Justification for incomplete or missing data due to extenuating circumstances will not be permitted for two or more consecutive reports. Representative samples should include data from students at a distance (regional campuses or online/video) if courses are offered at these locations/through these modalities.
- ☒ 2. Data reporting is accurate and thorough (see supporting narrative)

Accurate and thorough data reporting means:

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

☒ 3. Results for each measure indicate whether the target for that measure has been met
This may be done explicitly (e.g., "target met" or "target not met") or implicitly (i.e., the reported data clearly indicate whether the target was or was not met).

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

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

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

Additional Indicators:

☐ 7. Data collection and analysis are used to assess the impact of implemented changes, demonstrating a fully "closed loop" process.
When an outcome and/or measure(s) evaluates the impact of a previously reported change, the reflective statement for that outcome should include a determination of whether the change resulted in an improvement.

☐ 8. Follow-up data collected to assess the impact of implemented changes show improved outcomes. Meeting this final criterion for one or more measures is the ultimate goal of IE Assessment. When data confirm improvement(s) in student learning outcomes, program quality, or unit operations, the improvement(s) should be well documented in the applicable reflective statement(s). In addition, the Summary of Assessment Process should provide a brief narrative that describes the entire "closed loop" process that resulted in the improvement(s).

Summary of Quality Improvements:

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

n/a

Review Criteria:

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

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Review:

The program has future data collection as a priority and should be able to "close the loop" with additional information. DG 10/15/15

- Zack's notes 11/9/15
- The necessary data is there for most measures and enough so for us to check items 1-6 on the rating rubric. Giving an overall rating of 3-Maturing

- I was on the fence a bit about item #1 "complete and relevant data"... The most dire information was there but we want to see the granular/disaggregate data and analysis
- There is very little analysis of the data throughout the plan. This doesn't effect the current rating, but you will be unable to move past the 3-Maturing rating until this starts to occur... What does the data tell us about the strengths and weaknesses? What can be improved? What might the program do to create improvement in student learning? What may have caused increases or decreases in scores? What has the program done previously that may have caused improvement etc.
- Items #7 and #8 have to do with past changes and measuring improvement... There are no past changes identified in the results report so these cannot be checked. As mentioned above the program will be unable to "close the loop", and move to a 4 or 5 rating until it begins analyzing data as described above and implementing changes to improve student learning.

Site maintained by Operational Excellence and Assessment Support

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Webmaster](#)