UCF Assessment

Assessment Plan and Results

Plan Year: 2015-2016 ▼   Status: Results Approved for DRC Report
Program/Unit: Human Communication - B.A.   ▼ Last Updated: 1/24/2017 2:03:13 PM

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

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

View/Submit Results Review 🔴   2014-2015 Results Review

Program/Unit: Human Communication - B.A.	DRC:	College of Sciences	
Year:	2015-2016	DRC Chair:	Elizabeth Grauerholz
Due Date:		Coordinator(s):	Kim Tuorto, Boyd Lindsley, James Katt
		Reviewer(s):	Peter Sinelli

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:
Five 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 - Communicaiton 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 innclude Com3013 – Communication and the Family, Com3022 - Health Communicaiton, Com3110 - Business & Professional Communicaiton, 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.

Last year 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.

Relationship to 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 assessement our Human Communication students' ability to effectively communicate, orally and in writing, as annunciated in the strategic outcome of producing an educated citizenty.

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 (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 caluclate 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 175 students enrolled in Spc3301 (Interpersonal Communication). The students correctly answered 79.7% of embedded questions pertaining to demonstrating an understanding of constructs, terminology, and historical influences applicable to communication in the context of Interpersonal Communication various contexts. This result is within a half-percent of meeting 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 83.4%; this year 79.7%.

Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed
◉ Satisfactory

Measure: 1.2

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]

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 97 students enrolled in Com3120 (Organizational Communication). The students correctly answered 81.5% of the embedded questions pertaining to their understanding of the constructs, terminology, and historical influences in the context of Organizational Communication. This result 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 82.5%; this year 81.5%.

Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Measure: 1.3
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]

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 205 students enrolled in Com3003 (Exploring Human Communication). The students correctly answered 90.2% of the embedded questions pertaining to their understanding of the constructs, terminology, and historical influences in the context of Exploring Human 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:
No comparative data -- Com3003 was not previously assessed for this PLO.

Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

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

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

This year is the first time we measured student learning in our Com3003 (Exploring Human Communication) course, since we plan to phase out Com3110 (Communication and Human Relations) as a core course and replace it with Com3003. The mean average for all three measures (83.8%) exceeds the standard, which we feel reflects well on the program.

Reflective Statement Review:

◯ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Your 80% benchmarks for success on the embedded questions in these three courses seem appropriate. Although scores were slightly down on measures 1.1 and 1.2 these do not seem to be statistically significant deviations from prior results. PS 9/19/16

- Zack's notes 12/13/16
- Measure 1.1
    - The main information/data is good.
    - We would like to see some disaggregate/granular data and some analysis/discussion of the results. Is there a particular set of questions that the students are having more difficulty with than others? There was about 4% decrease from last year. What may have caused the decline? is it something to look into or is it just statistical fluctuation? You did not meet the target his year. What might the program do to try and improve those scores going forward? etc.
- Measure 1.2
    - Same comments as 1.1
- Measure 1.3:
    - essentially the same comments as the other two measures. disaggregate/granular data and analysis/discussion of the results.
- Reflective Statement:
    - Good summary, but we want to see some analysis/reflection/discussion of the data and what it means.

- Zack's notes on revisions 1/24/17
- There were no explicitly required revisions for this outcome only suggestions. It seems that the suggestions were not addressed.

Attachments: Spc3301_PLO1-1_2015_HumCom.docx   Com3120_PLO1-2_2015_HumCom.docx   Com3003_PLO1-3_2015_HumCom.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

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]

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 175 students enrolled in Spc3301 (Interpersonal Communication). The students correctly answered 77.0% of embedded questions pertaining to demonstrating an understanding of the theories, models, and principles in the context of Interpersonal Communication. 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 77.2%; this year 70.0%. See Reflective Statement (below).

Review:

◉ Revision or explanation needed

○ Satisfactory

Measure: 2.2

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]

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 97 students enrolled in Com3120 (Organizational Communication). The students correctly answered 79.5% of the embedded questions pertaining to their understanding of the theories, models, and principles that apply to Organizational Communication. This percentage is within a half-percent of meeting 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 81.9%; this year 79.5%. See Reflective Statement (below).

Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Measure: 2.3
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]

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 203 students enrolled in Com3003 (Exploring Human Communication). The students correctly answered 85.2% of the embedded questions pertaining to their understanding of the theories, models, and principles that apply to the context of Exploring Human 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:

No comparative data -- Com3003 was not previously assessed for this PLO.

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).

Although this year's mean average for all three measures (80.6%) represents a slight increase over last year's mean (79.3%), this year 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:

In measure 2.1 you list this year's results as 77.0% passing in one place then as 70.0% in another. Which figure is correct? If it is 77% then the lower results vs. the 80% objective and 77.2% results from last year would not be significant, but if it is 70% for this year then there may be a need to explore why the results took such a dip for 2015-16. PS 9-19-16

- Zack's notes 12/13/16
- Measure 2.1:
  - Same comments as 1.1. The main data is there, but we want to see more. disaggregated data and analysis.
- Measure 2.2:
  - Same comments as previous measures. disaggregate data and analysis.
  - The reviewer is correct that in the main body it says 77% but in comparing to last year's data is says 70%. Please correct.
- Measure 2.3:
  - Same comments as previous measures.
- Reflective Statement:
  - Same comments as previous outcome. discussion/reflection/analysis.

- Zack's notes for revisions 1/24/17
- The data correction revision requested was actually meant for measure 2.1. The data has not been correct. It seems that the additional suggested revisions were also not addressed.

Attachments: HumCom_PgmObjectives_v05.pdf   Spc3301_PLO2-1_2015_HumCom.docx
Com3120_PLO2-2_2015_HumCom.docx   Com3003_PLO2-3_2015_HumCom.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

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]

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 175 students enrolled in Spc3301 (Interpersonal Communication). The students correctly answered 82.3% of embedded questions pertaining to their ability to apply theory-based communication strategies in the context of Interpersonal 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 80.2%; this year 82.3%

Review:

◯ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Measure: 3.2

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]

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 97 students enrolled in Com3120 (Organizational Communication). The students correctly answered 80.0% of the embedded questions pertaining to their ability to apply theory-based communication strategies in the context of Organizational 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 88.0%; this year 80.0%.

Review:

◯ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Measure: 3.3

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]

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 205 students enrolled in Com3003 (Exploring Human Communication). The students correctly answered 84.2% of the embedded questions pertaining to their ability to apply theory-based communication strategies in the context of Exploring Human 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:
No comparative data -- Com3003 was not previously assessed for this PLO.

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:
Agreed--these measures seem to be working well for your department. PS 9/19/16

- Zack's notes 12/13/16
- Same comments as for all previous measures and reflective statements. The main data is there, but we also want to see some granular/disaggregate data and analysis/discussion of the results. What caused these results? What are strong and weak areas? What can be improved? What will you do to improve it? If there was improvement or decline what caused it? Was there something that the program did that contributed to improvement? etc.

- Zack's notes 1/24/17
- It seems that the suggested revisions were not addressed.

Attachments: Spc3301_PLO3-1_2015_HumCom.docx   Com3120_PLO3-2_2015_HumCom.docx   Com3003_PLO3-3_2015_HumCom.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

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]

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 150 students enrolled in Com3311 (Communication Research Methods). The students correctly answered 76.7% 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 85.6%; this year 79.5%. See Reflective Statement (below).

Review:

◉ Revision or explanation needed

○ Satisfactory

Measure: 4.2

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]

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 150 students enrolled in Com3311 (Communication Research Methods). The students correctly answered 76.7% 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 77.2%; this year 76.7%. See Reflective Statement (below).

Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Measure: 4.3

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]

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 150 students enrolled in Com3311 (Communication Research Methods). The students correctly answered 79.6% of the embedded questions pertaining to their ability to identify and understand quantitative and qualitative data analysis as used in Communication research. This percentage is within a half-percent of meeting 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 81.6%; this year 79.6%. 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).

Although the mean average (78.6%) for the three measures for Outcome 4 was not substantially lower than last year's mean (81.2%), we are concerned that all three measures were lower this year (especially measure 4.1). 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 in your discussion of Measure 4.1 you list two different numbers. As for the discussion among the faculty for the lower results across all measures for this objective, it would be helpful to include any ideas or changes for future improvement to this measure in your plan for next year. PS 9-19-16

- Zack's notes 12/13/16
- The reviewer is correct in the body for 4.1 results it says 76.7% but when comparing to last year's data is says 79.5%.
- Same comments as for all previous measures and reflective statements. The main data is there, but we also want to see some granular/disaggregate data and analysis/discussion of the results. What caused these results? What are strong and weak areas? What can be improved? What will you do to improve it? If there was improvement or decline what caused it? Was there something that the program did that contributed to improvement? etc.
- Discussing with the faculty what changes might be made is good, but we would also like to see some discussion of what might be done in this report too.

- Zack's notes on revisions 1/24/17

- The data correction request for measure 4.1 was not addressed. It seems that the additional suggested revisions have also not been addressed.

Attachments: HumCom_PgmObjectives_v05.pdf   Com3311_PLO4-1_2015_HumCom.docx
Com3311_PLO4-2_2015_HumCom.docx   Com3311_PLO4-3_2015_HumCom.docx

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 (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]

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 47 students enrolled in Com4461 (Intercultural Communication). The students correctly answered 74.3% 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 falls 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:
No comparison data available -- Com4461 was not used to assess PLO 5 last year.

Review:

⦿ Revision or explanation needed

⦿ Satisfactory

Measure: 5.2

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]

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 44 students enrolled in Com4014 (Gender Issues in Communication). Students correctly answered 90.2% of 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:
For measure 5.2 this year's score (90.2%) was substantially higher than last year (82.0%).

Review:

⦿ Revision or explanation needed

⦿ Satisfactory

Measure: 5.3

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]

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 33 students enrolled in Com3110 (Business & Professional Communication). The students correctly answered 83.0% of the 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:
For measure 5.3 this year's score (83.0%) was substantially higher than last year (73.3%).

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).

One of the three measures for Outcome 5 falls 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:

These results seem in line with those measured in the previous objectives. However, at the end of each of the measures 5.1-5.3 you write "(or another restricted elective course)" yet only discuss results from the course specifically mentioned in each measure. If you aren't going to use other "restricted electives" to measure the outcome then just delete that phrase. I feel like your measures of the existing courses are doing their job well and there's no need to muddy it. PS 9/19/16

- Zack's notes 12/13/16

- Same comments as for all previous measures and reflective statements. The main data is there, but we also want to see some granular/disaggregate data and analysis/discussion of the results. What caused these results? What are strong and weak areas? What can be improved? What will you do to improve it? If there was improvement or decline what caused it? Was there something that the program did that contributed to improvement? etc.
- For measure 5.3 you appear to have significant improvement. Discuss what may have caused it. If something that the program did to try to create improvement caused it, tell us what change was made, why the change was made, how you expected it to create improvement, and how it created improvement. If you can do that you have "closed the loop".

- Zack's notes 1/24/17
- It seems that the suggested revisions were not addressed.

Attachments: Com4461_PLO5-1_2015_HumCom.docx   Com4014_PLO5-2_2015_HumCom.docx Com3110_PLO5-3_2015_HumCom.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
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]

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 43 students enrolled in Com3013 (Communication and the Family). The students answered 77.0% 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

Communication and the Family. This percentage falls 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:
No comparison data available - Com3013 was not used to assess PLO 6 last year.

Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Measure: 6.2
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]

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 answered 81.0% 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 Health Communication. 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:
No comparison data. Health Communication was not assessed under PLO 6 last year.

Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Measure: 6.3

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]

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 46 students enrolled in Spc4540 (Persuasion). Students correctly answered 83.2% 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 Persuasion. 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:

This item (PLO #6 in the context of persuasion) was measure 6.1 on last year's assessment. Last year's score was 82.7%, so this year's 83.2% represents a half-percent increase over last year. We do not believe this increase is meaningful.

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 "(or another restricted elective course)" seems unnecessary. Also, it is commendable that you have expanded your measures to include courses that were not previously used for assessment. This provides a more complete picture of program effectiveness and should produce strong data for comparative purposes in coming cycles. PS 9/19/16

- Zack's notes 12/13/16
- Same comments as for all previous measures and reflective statements. The main data is there, but we also want to see some granular/disaggregate data and analysis/discussion of the results. What caused these results? What are strong and weak areas? What can be improved? What will you do to improve it? If there was improvement or decline what caused it? Was there something that the program did that contributed to improvement? etc.

- Zack's notes on revisions 1/24/17
- It seems the suggested revisions were not addressed.

Attachments: HumCom_PgmObjectives_v05.pdf   Com3013_PLO6-1_2015_HumCom.docx Com3022_PLO6-2_2015_HumCom.docx   Spc4540_PLO6-3_2015_HumCom.docx

Top

Outcome: 7

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

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 68 graduating seniors who responded to the item, 91.2% 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:
This year 91.2%; last year 85.5%

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 68 graduating seniors who responded to the item, 100.0% agreed or strongly agreed that the program developed my competence "communicating in small group settings." This exceeds the objective. Closer examination the data revealed that 60.2% "strongly agreed," and 39.7% "agreed."

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

◉ Yes

○ No

If yes, describe the improvement by giving a comparison with previous year's results. If no, please explain:
This year 100%; last year 92.6%

Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Measure: 7.3

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.

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

From students taking Com3110 (Business & Professional Communication), 21 students were selected randomly (systematic random sampling). Their presentations were scored using the attached rubric. All 21 were rated "effective" or "very effective," exceeding the objective. Closer examination of the data revealed that 8 were rated "effective" and 13 were rated "very effective."

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

○ Yes

◉ No

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

No comparative data - This measure is being used for the first time this assessment 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).

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, this year our embedded presentation assessments for this objective were used (in addition to the GSS data) to provide a richer data set.

Reflective Statement Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

These measurement tools complement the embedded question data nicely. Measuring the students' opinions on the exit exam AND measuring a random sample of student performance as evaluated by a professional produces robust and informative results. PS 9/19/16

- Zack's notes 12/13/16
- Same comments as for all previous measures and reflective statements. The main data is there, but we also want to see some granular/disaggregate data and analysis/discussion of the results. What caused these results? What are strong and weak areas? What can be improved? What will you do to improve it? If there was improvement or decline what caused it? Was there something that the program did that contributed to improvement? etc.

- Zack's notes 1/24/17
- It seems the suggested revisions were not addressed.

Attachments: HumCom_PgmObjectives_v05.pdf   Rubric_Item7-3.docx

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 68 graduating seniors who responded to the item, 88.2% agreed or strongly agreed that the

program "developed my competence as a writer." 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:
The improvement (from 83.6% to 88.2%) may be the result of increased awareness of writing on the part of our faculty. A single year improvement, however, is could be a function of the sample; we will monitor this item in future assessments.

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 writing sample.

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

From the 205 students enrolled in Com3003 (Exploring Human Communication), a 10% sample (22 students) was randomly selected (systematic random sampling). Their writing samples were then assessed using the attached rubric. Of the 22 writing samples 17 (77.3%) were rated "satisfactory" or better, exceeding 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:
No comparative data -- Embedded writing assignments were not previously assessed for this PLO.

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 access writing competence. This year we have included an embedded diagnostic writing assignment. Although a single year's data is insufficient to make inferences, 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 confident writers.

Reflective Statement Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

I completely agree with your reflective statement. These are great tools you have implemented and will provide the richer picture over time. I have a question about the benchmark in Measure 8.2 however. Every other measure in the assessment is at 80% and this single one is at 75%. Is there a specific reason for this? Might you consider revising it to 80% to remain consistent with all of the other benchmarks? Just a thought. PS 9/19/16

- Zack's notes 12/13/16
- Same comments as for all previous measures and reflective statements. The main data is there, but we also want to see some granular/disaggregate data and analysis/discussion of the results. What caused these results? What are strong and weak areas? What can be improved? What will you do to improve it? If there was improvement or decline what caused it? Was there something that the program did that contributed to improvement? etc.

- Zack's notes 1/24/17
- It seems the suggested revisions were not addressed.

Attachments: Rubric_Item8-2.docx   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

Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed

⦿ Satisfactory

Review Comments:

Your assessment tools are diverse and robust. You use embedded questions in a wide variety of courses, thereby ensuring a more complete picture of student performance across your curriculum. Additionally, the GSS data and the random samples of student work add broader context to the embedded question data by providing a more holistic view of student performance. Overall an excellent set of assessment tools. PS 9/19/16

- Zack's notes 12/13/16
- This section looks pretty good.
- All of the appropriate instruments are identified here. I also like that you identify which outcomes the instruments are tied to.
- In addition to what instrument is used, and what outcome it is tied to, we would also like to see explanation of what data is collected using that instrument. For example "We use the GSS in measure 8.1 to assess student perception of their writing skills."

Explain EACH item checked above:

Data was gathered primarily from embedded exam questions. Assessment rubrics and 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:

n/a

Surveys:

Institution (UCF):

☑ UCF Graduating Student Survey (Seniors or Graduate student)

☐ Alumni Survey

☐ Student Satisfaction Survey

☐ First Destination Survey

☐ Employee Survey

☐ Entering Student Survey

Explain EACH item checked above:

GSS results used in Outcomes 7 and 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:

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

☐ 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.

n/a

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.

n/a

Changes to Assessment Plan:

☐ Revise Student Outcome Statement

☐ Revise Measurement Approach

☐ Collect and Analyze Additional Data and Information

☐ Change Method of Data Collection

☐ Other implemented or

Review Comments:

Your department added several new measures this cycle, which have generated new data for the first time. I agree that it is appropriate to see how the data generated by these new measures evolves over time before making any additional changes to the structure of your assessment. PS 9/19/16

- Zack's notes 12/13/16
- The review is correct in mentioning that you added new measures. Those should be documented here as implemented changes to the assessment plan.
- Any change the program made previously that may have affected the results in this report should be documented as Implemented changes
  - When documenting implemented changes we want to know 1. What change was made 2. Why it was made. 3. How it was expected to improve results. 4. Did improvement occur due to the change.
- Any change that the program might make, plans to make, or has already made that will affect future results should be documented as planned changes.
  - When documenting planned changes we want to know. 1 What change is being made. 2. Why the changes is being made. 3. How the change is expected to improve results.
  - Even if something is not set in stone and it is something that the program is just considering doing it can be discussed here as a planned chage.
- Going forward in order to "close the loop" you need to identify areas that need improvement, plan changes to create the improvement, implement the changes and collect data related to them on the next results report, analyze the data to see if improvement occured due to the change.

- Zack's notes on revisions 1/24/17
- It seems that the suggested revisions were not addressed.

planned change(s)
☐ Plan has been reviewed and no changes made
☑ No Changes to Assessment Plan

If 'No Changes' indicated, please provide an explanation, including a strategy to improve IE assessment data collection to yield useful information.
After the faculty has reviewed and discussed the results of this assessment period (2015), desired changes (if any) will be incorporated into the 2016 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).

Since re-vamping our assessment process, we believe we have vastly improved the quality of our data, but there is still much more work to do. Last year we identified our assessment challenges as a) increasing the faculty participation, b) refining and adjusting the measurement process, especially in the area of student writing, and c) identifying and implementing strategies to close the loop with regard to program improvement. We believe we have made progress on faculty participation and refining the measurement process. We look forward to meeting with the faculty, discussing the current results, and looking for ways to close the loop.

Review Criteria:

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

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Review:

I agree that the new measures implemented for this cycle have led to a more comprehensive assessment process. The data generated in future cycles by these new measures will add depth and breadth to your assessment process as year over year comparisons become possible in the future. I think you have all the tools in place to measure your program from many angles, and that over time, these will indeed permit you to close the loop. PS 9/19/16

- Zack's notes 12/13/16
- Overall the plan is very good and the results are clear and contain the most pertinent information.
- However, there are a few things that can be done to make the report stronger.
- Currently, we have rated this results report 2-Emerging. Below is a breakdown of each rubric item, whether it was met or not, what must be done to meet it, and/or how it can be made stronger on future reports.
  - Rubric item #1 and #2 are related to the data being accurate, relevant, thorough, and complete
    - We gave credit for rubric item #1 but not #2.
    - The main issue is that there are 2 measures 2.2 and 4.1 in which in one place you report one number but in another place you report a different number for the same results. Please correct or explain

this and we will give credit for item #2.

- Additionally, not a deal breaker, but important for future reports. The complete and thorough aspects related to these items could be made stronger. Througout the report you will see comments from me requesting that you include more granular/disaggregate data and more analysis/discussion/reflection of the results. For future results reports please include this additional information.

  - Rubric item #3 is related to if "target not met" or "target met" is checked and accurate.
    - Yes, we did give credit for this item. All measures are marked and appear to be marked accurately.
  - Rubric item #4 is related to reflective statements.
    - Yes, we did give credit for this item.
    - That being said I believe the reflective statements could be made stronger on future reports. You will see comments from me throughout the report asking for more analysis of the results in the reflective statements. Please be sure to include that in the future.
  - Rubric item #5 is related to implemented or planned changes
    - No, we did not give credit for this item.
    - I did not see any evidence of an implemented or planned change designed to create improved results. If you can discuss an implemented or planned change. i.e. (what the change was/is, why the change was/is being made, and how it was/is expected to create improvement. We can give credit for this item.
  - Rubric item #6 is related to attachments
    - Yes, we did give credit for this item.
    - All necessary attachments appear to be included.
  - Rubric item #7 and #8 are related to assessing if improvement occurred as part of the closed loop process.
    - No, we did not give credit for these items.
    - Firstly, the system will not allow us to give credit for these items unless all of items 1-6 are met.

- Secondly, in order to receive credit for this item you need to demonstrate that the program made a changes previously with the intention of improving student learning/performance on these results, and that data was collected to determine if the implemented change did indeed contribute to improvement. I did not see any evidence of this in the report. If you can discuss a past change and describe what change was made, why it was made, and how it was expected to created improvement, and whether or not improvement occurred as a result of the change we can give credit for #7. If you can provide everything necessary for #7 and we see that improvement did occur we can give credit for #8.

- Zack's notes on revisions 1/24/17
- It appears that no revisions were made.
- This is unforatunate because two data corrections and any indication of a planned or implemented changed would have raised the rating from 2-emerging to 3-maturing. Additionally, it is worrisome that the program has indicated no planned or implemented changes for the program. This make it very difficult for the program to demonstrate a closed loop.