

UCF Assessment

Assessment Plan and Results

Plan Year: Status: Results Approved for DRC Report
 Program/Unit: Last Updated: 10/24/2017 5:11:50 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  2015-2016 Results Review

Program/Unit:	Human Communication - B.A.	DRC:	College of Sciences
Year:	2016-2017	DRC Chair:	Elizabeth Grauerholz
Due Date:		Coordinator(s):	Kim Tuorto, James Katt, Deanna Sellnow, Lindsay Neuberger
		Reviewer(s):	Michael Armato

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:

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

The Program Assessment for Human Communication is accomplished primarily through imbedded assessments in the various core and elective courses. The core courses include Spc3301 –

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

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

Relationship to Strategic Plan:

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 assessment our Human Communication students' ability to effectively communicate, orally and in writing, as announced in the strategic outcome of producing an educated citizenry.

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 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 178 students enrolled in Spc3301 (Interpersonal Communication). The students correctly answered 84.8% of embedded questions pertaining to demonstrating an understanding of constructs, terminology, and historical influences applicable to communication in the context of Interpersonal Communication. This result 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's results indicated an improvement of over five percentage points (last year = 79.7; this year = 84.8)

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 131 students enrolled in Com3120 (Organizational Communication). The students correctly answered 74.8% of the embedded questions pertaining to their understanding of the constructs, terminology, and historical influences in the context of Organizational Communication. This result 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:

Last year's score of 81.5% met the objective.

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 198 students enrolled in Com3003 (Exploring Human Communication). The students correctly answered 90.6% 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:

For all practical purposes, last year's score of 90.2 was the same as this year's score of 90.6.

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 was the second time we measured student learning in our Com3003 (Exploring Human Communication) course, as we are phasing out Com3110 (Communication and Human Relations) as a core course and replacing it with Com3003. The mean average for all three measures (83.4%) exceeds the standard, which we feel reflects well on the program. We are concerned, however, that the scores in Com3120 (Organizational Communication) decreased from the previous year's scores by over 5 percentage points. A preliminary analysis of the data did not reveal any change in curriculum or pedagogy that explains the lower scores. We will pass this finding along to the new Program Coordinator for further consideration in next year's plan.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

First, thanks for your work on the Plan & Results. It's implemented quite well! [MA 8/14/17]

1.2 & Reflective Statement: If possible, can you say a little more as to WHY your results changed--both in terms of decreasing and increasing. Did you do anything or not do something that caused the changes in outcomes? Finally, w/r/t to the Reflective Statement, do you have any plans for improving upon measure 1.2? Of course, any plan you develop should grow from your comments as to why you think you didn't meet the goal this year (though you were close). [MA 8/14/17]

LG comments 9/22/17: I understand that your using the same measures in 3 different courses to assess students' understanding, and they met the target in two classes and not one. Overall, looks fine but wonder if there's any explanation you could provide for results in COM3120 or anything you might propose doing differently in that course? Just a little elaboration in the reflection statement would help.

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

Top

Outcome: 2

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

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

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

Measure: 2.1

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 178 students enrolled in Spc3301 (Interpersonal Communication). The students correctly answered 84.8% of embedded questions pertaining to demonstrating an understanding of the theories, models, and principles 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 = 77.0%; this year = 84.8%

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 131 students enrolled in Com3120 (Organizational Communication). The students correctly answered 78.4% of the embedded questions pertaining to their understanding of the theories, models, and principles that apply to Organizational

Communication. This percentage is within a two percentage points 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:

This year's score of 78.4% was approximately one-percent lower than last year's 79.5%.

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 198 students enrolled in Com3003 (Exploring Human Communication). The students correctly answered 84.0% 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:

Both last year's score of 85.2% and this year's score of 84.0% exceeded the standard for this measure.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Reflective Statement:

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

This year's mean average for all three measures (81.7%) represents a slight increase over last year's mean (80.6%); this year two of the three measures of Outcome 2 exceeded the standard (up from one of three last year). The course that fell short of the target was Com3120 (Organizational Communication) decreased from the previous year's scores by approximately one percentage point. Although the decrease is small, the fact that Com3120's scores have fallen for several of the measures suggest further investigation is warranted. We will suggest that the new Program Coordinator that 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:

This section is strong; you could (should) say a bit more about what you did as a program to produce the results you achieved. As it reads now, your reflective statement remains descriptive of the findings, but not explanatory as to why you achieved those results. You're clearly doing things well; underscore what practices have helped you achieve this. For example, perhaps past discussions about learning objectives with faculty teaching the courses have helped those faculty be more explicit about tending to the learning outcomes in their teaching/assignments. [MA 8/14/17]

LG Comments 9/22/17: I agree with Reviewer. Can you attribute these improvements to anything the program has done? The changes noted in the Assessment Process statement at the beginning would likely count.

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

Top

Outcome: 3

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

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

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

Measure: 3.1

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 192 students enrolled in Spc3301 (Interpersonal Communication). The students correctly answered 91.7% of embedded questions pertaining to their ability to apply theory-based communication strategies in the context of Interpersonal Communication. This percentage exceeds the objective. Post hoc examination revealed that students from large main campus section (177 students) scored considerably lower than students from small regional campus section (15 students).

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:

Scores increased by nearly 10 percent over last year: Last year = 82.3; This year = 91.7

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 131 students enrolled in Com3120

(Organizational Communication). The students correctly answered 77.7% of the embedded questions pertaining to their ability to apply theory-based communication strategies in the context of Organizational 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:

This year's result was slightly lower than last year: last year 80.0; this year 77.7

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 198 students enrolled in Com3003 (Exploring Human Communication). The students correctly answered 78.5% of the embedded questions pertaining to their ability to apply theory-based communication strategies in the context of Exploring Human 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:

Although this year's score falls short of the objective by 1.5 points, it falls short of last year's score (84.2%) by over 5 points. Since this is just the second year of using this particular course, it is difficult to determine which is normative.

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's mean average for all three measures (82.6%) exceeds the standard. It is of some concern, however, that two of the three measures (including findings from Com3120) fell short of their individual targets. Although this seems to be a recurring theme with regard to Com3120. Once again, inspection of the data does not reveal an apparent curricular or pedagogical cause. It is possible that this single year's data could be an artifact. This said, next year's results should be examined closely when discussed among the faculty to determine what changes, if any, should be incorporated in future plans. Also, it might be useful to track performance differences in small and large classes (although it appears the small-sized classes are being phased out).

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

This section solid, but I've marked "revision or explanation needed" to highlight that your discussion of each of the measures--especially those where you don't meet goals--and your Reflective Statement could do more to explain WHY you think you achieved these results. Doing so would go a long way to assisting faculty in determining future plans for improvement. [MA 8/14/17]

LG Comments 9/22/17: I appreciate that you disaggregate data in 3.1 (by location) but could you provide actual scores here so the comparison is clear? Are these data not available for 3.2 and 3.3? (This is the type of granular data analysis we're hoping to see.) As the Reviewer notes, a little more explanation of why you didn't meet goals would be helpful. Maybe it's not clear, but just acknowledging that you don't know would be helpful.

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

Top

Outcome: 4

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

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

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

Measure: 4.1

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 28 students enrolled in Com3311 (Communication Research Methods). The students correctly answered 78.6% of the embedded questions pertaining to their ability to identify and understand various research methods used in Communication research. This percentage is within one-and-one-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:

Although this measure fell slightly from last year (last year = 79.5%; this year = 78.6%) the year-to-year difference is trivial.

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 103 students enrolled in Com3311 (Communication Research Methods). The students correctly answered 73.4% of the embedded questions pertaining to their ability to identify and understand measurement and sampling techniques used in Communication research. 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:

This measure fell slightly from last year (last year = 76.7%; this year = 73.4%). Although the year-to-year difference fairly small, it is of concern that the performance on this measure is trending in the wrong direction.

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 103 students enrolled in Com3311 (Communication Research Methods). The students correctly answered 82.2% 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 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 = 79.6; this year 82.2%

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's mean average (78.1%) for the three Outcome 4 measures was essentially the same as last year's mean (78.6%). We are concerned that students achieved the target for only one of the three measures. There were no curricular or pedagogical differences apparent explain the slippage. We will call the situation to the attention of the new Program Coordinator and suggest that 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:

As with my above feedback, I encourage you to say a bit more about what, specifically is happening in your program's teaching that's producing these results. Once you've articulated the mechanisms that you think produce the results, it becomes much easier to decide if things need to be tweaked or changed markedly to meet goals. [MA 8/14/17]

LG Comments 9/22/17: Agree with Reviewer. Reflecting on something the program might do to create improvement (e.g., a study guide or practice quiz on Canvas) would help demonstrate a closed loop next round.

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

Top

Outcome: 5

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

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

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

Measure: 5.1

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 111 students enrolled in Com4461 (Intercultural Communication). The students correctly answered 80.4% 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 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 = 74.3% this year = 80.4%

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 125 students enrolled in Com4014 (Gender Issues in Communication). Students correctly answered 82.8% of embedded questions pertaining to their ability to recognize communication behaviors necessary to effectively communicate in a diverse society. 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 students fared very well on this measure (90.2%). The faculty felt the scores were an anomaly; this year's score (82.8%) lend credence to that theory.

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 91 students enrolled in Com3110 (Business & Professional Communication). The students correctly answered 80.2% of the embedded questions pertaining to their ability to recognize communication behaviors necessary to effectively communicate in a diverse society. 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:

Although not as high as last year's scores (83.0%), this year's score (80.2%) meets the target.

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's mean average for the three Outcome 5 measures was 81.1%, with all individual objectives met. We feel this reflects well on the program and suggests that the faculty who are delivering these restricted elective course have their teaching and learning processes "dialed in" and should be encouraged to stay the course.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

My comments are same for this section--do more to try to identify mechanisms that produce results, whether you meet goals or not; that way you can think about what, specifically needs to be changed, tweaked, emphasized, etc. [MA 8/14/17]

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

Top

Outcome: 6

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

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

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

Measure: 6.1

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 40 students enrolled in Com3013 (Communication and the Family). The students answered 83.3% 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 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 = 75.0; this year = 83.3%

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 40 students enrolled in Com3022 (Health Communication). The students answered 79.8% 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 Health Communication. This percentage falls two-tenths of one-percent 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:

Slightly lower this year (79.8) than last year (80.0%); the difference is trivial.

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 44 students enrolled in SPC4540 (Persuasion). Students correctly answered 86.3% 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:

Last year = 83.2%; this year 86.3%

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 of Outcome 6 falls slightly short of the objective. Again, we must be careful not to put too much stock in the results of a single year. We will suggest to the incoming PC consideration of a longitudinal analysis of the two Outcomes (#5 and #6) that use data from restrictive elective courses, to see have student performance tracks over several years, and discussing the results 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:

Same feedback as above--infuse into your Reflective Statement what you've done to produce these results. That said, good to read that faculty plan to discuss things (here and in above sections). [MA 8/14/17]

LG Comments 9/22/17: Agree with reviewer. The improvement is noteworthy. Is there anything the program (or these instructors) have done that might account for the improvement? Explanation would be helpful.

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

[Top](#)**Outcome: 7**

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

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

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

Measure: 7.1

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 221 graduating seniors who responded to the item, 89.1% 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:

89.1% of last year's graduating Seniors agreed or strongly agreed that the program developed their confidence as speakers, as compared to 91.2% last year. The year-to-year difference is trivial.

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 221 graduating seniors who responded to the item, 100.0% agreed or strongly agreed that the program developed "my sensitivity to the needs of others." This exceeds the objective. Closer examination of the data revealed that 50.2% "strongly agreed," and 38.0% "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:

No comparison available; a different question was used this year.

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), 20 students were selected randomly (systematic random sampling). Their presentations were scored using the attached rubric. All 20 were rated "effective" or "very effective," 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:

Last year = 100%; this year = 100%

Review:

☐ Revision or explanation needed

☒ Satisfactory

Reflective Statement:

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

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

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 measures, 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:

Strong section. I think you could say a tad more about why or how "the program does very well with regard to helping students become more competent communicators." You might note, for example, that students get the opportunity to practice these skills at least X number of times across an array of courses. There appears to be a word/phrase missing in Reflective Statement, which currently reads, "We are looking for ways to create authentic..." There appears to be something missing after the word "authentic." [MA 8/14/17]

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

[Top](#)**Outcome: 8**

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

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

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

Measure: 8.1

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 219 graduating seniors who responded to the item, 82.7% 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:

Last year's score was 88.2% (which the faculty felt was surprisingly high), this year's 82.7 may be more realistic.

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 approximately 200 students enrolled in Com3003 (Exploring Human Communication), a 15% sample (30 students) was randomly selected (systematic random sampling). Their writing samples were then assessed using the attached rubric. Of the 30 writing samples, 21 (70.0%) were rated "satisfactory" or better, falling 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:

D/N/A - different assignment/rubric

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 the GSS data (8.1), it appears that our students' writing meets the expectations of the learning objective. The data from our re-vamped embedded diagnostic writing assignment (8.2) tell a somewhat different story. 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. We are in the process of pilot-testing writing modules designed to be helpful in improving students' focus, usage, and readability of written assignments.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Strong section. This is your strongest Reflective Statement, as it provides specific strategies (i.e., writing modules) that you plan to try in future. [MA 8/14/17]

LG Comments 9/22/17: I agree. The change you discuss here (pilot-testing modules) is excellent.

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

This looks good. [MA 8/14/17]

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
- ☐ 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.

Criteria:

Please comment on implemented and planned changes

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

Review:

- ☒ Revision or explanation needed
- ☐ Satisfactory

Review Comments:

In the "Changes to Curriculum" section, you should select "revise course content" to capture your development of new "pilot" writing modules. [MA 8/14/17]

LG Comments 9/22/17: I agree. You do suggest that you're making a change so document here as Planned Change. Also, I think you should get credit for the Implemented Change you made to the Assessment Process which most certainly affected these Results (as described in the statement at the top), specifically you can mark "Change Method of Data Collection."

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 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 (2016), desired changes (if any) will be incorporated into the 2017 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, with data from over 1,300 respondents gathered and analyzed. We look forward to meeting with the faculty, discussing the current results, and looking for ways to further 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:

The Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Results Rubric is close to being "maturing," "accomplished," and perhaps even "exemplary" with only a little bit of development. Your program appears very astute with regard to assessment, so you appear to be doing what you need to be doing. What's needed to strengthen your results/plan is a clear articulation of the mechanisms employed to achieve the results you've gotten. [MA 8/14/17]
Summary is strong. [MA 8/14/17]

Again, thanks for your work on this! -m.a.

LG Comments 9/22/17: I don't have much to add to what the Reviewer says here. Developing the Reflective Statements a bit more and making one change explicit will allow us to check #4 & 5 on the rubric. If you can link implemented changes to results or better yet, improvements, we can check #7 & 8. This linkage needs to be clear--both in Refl Statements and in the Implemented & Planned Changes section. I'm quite sure you have it, it's just not clear in this report. I would also like to see more granular data--analysis by group, e.g. You do this for 3.1 but not others. Doing this can really help the program see where targeted changes might be warranted.

LG comment 10/24/17: You've provided a little more explanation in the Refl Statement. I was hoping to see more on Implemented/Planned Changes in the the section above. You do note a change in 8.2 so I went ahead and checked #5. I believe assessment would be more useful to the program if you conducted more granular analysis. Then you could see where improvements might be needed and target your efforts.