

UCF Assessment

Assessment Plan and Results

Plan Year: Status: Results Approved for DRC Report
 Program/Unit: Last Updated: 1/17/2017 6:56:50 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  2014-2015 Results Review

Program/Unit: Journalism - B.A. DRC: College of Sciences
 Year: 2015-2016 DRC Chair: Elizabeth Grauerholz
 Due Date: Coordinator(s): Boyd Lindsley, Kim Tuorto, Steven Collins
 Reviewer(s): Traci Milbuta

Quick Links:

Mission:

Journalism can and should matter. That five-word phrase sums up the mission the School of Communication's Journalism program. If one trusts that a free and responsible press is the bedrock of democracy, then one must assume journalism education matters. It isn't a stretch to say the quality of professional journalism tomorrow is largely determined by the quality of journalism instruction today. Ours is a professional program, and its primary goal is to prepare students to work for the news media, especially websites, newspapers and magazines. Our academic program emphasizes communication, technical skills, research and critical thinking, necessary tools as our graduates engage in writing and editing. In addition to teaching students professional skills, the Journalism program also acquaints students with their historical heritage and with their legal and ethical rights and responsibilities. In a direct sense, our stakeholders include students, faculty, alumni and the members of the professional journalism community where our students intern and will ultimately work. In a broader sense, our stakeholders include members of the larger society because the quality of the news they'll be reading in the years to come is being shaped in our classrooms today.

Assessment Process:

The assessment process will be conducted by the journalism faculty and the data will come from three primary places, faculty review and evaluation of portfolios, internship supervisor evaluations and student surveys. 1. Portfolios: All students are required to submit a portfolio that includes at least ten published work samples the semester prior to graduation. No fewer than three faculty members review each portfolio. Faculty fill out two forms: One is the form (attached as Portfolio Evaluation Form 2010) that determines if the portfolio passes. This form is also considered for assessment purposes. The second form (attached as Portfolio.pdf) is for assessment purposes only. These two forms are available as attachments in this report for your review. They are attached under Outcome 1. 2. Internship Evaluations: Approximately 80 percent of students complete an internship. We realize that that leaves out 20 percent of our majors who do not. Here's the explanation for this. First, not all Journalism majors qualify for an internship. To obtain an internship, a student must have an overall GPA of 2.5 and must have completed the basic course that is related to the primary task of their

internship. For example, a student who desires to take an internship where her or his primary tasks would be writing and editing must have previously completed JOURNALISM 2100 News Reporting and JOURNALISM 3201 Editing, the basic courses pertaining to writing and editing. Also, because internships are not required in the major, a small segment of Journalism majors avoid doing them. However, the fact that the overwhelming majority of our students do complete at least one internship, and the fact that the external review and data that we obtain from editors and publishers in the field about the performance of these students is so valuable to us in measuring the quality of our instruction and the learning outcomes of the students, we keep the internship assessment data as a valuable centerpiece of the assessment of our program. The faculty has worked collaboratively to develop an internship assessment form that each employer fills out. In addition to using the form to help determine if a student should receive a satisfactory grade for the internship, we also use the data for assessment purposes. 3. Student surveys: This year's plan for the first time will include a student-centered perspective on specific student learning outcomes through the use of the graduating senior and first destination surveys. Although the journalism program is currently in a period of transition, our strategic plan and the skills we want to assess, such as the outcomes: use of good judgement, applying good writing and research skills, and understanding and exhibiting professional and ethical standards, remain the same. However, after analyzing the results of last year's assessment, it was determined that we were missing the students' perspective of our learning outcomes. For us to obtain necessary data we will need to effectively analyze our learning outcomes, we will need to add student centered measures to our current plan. At the end of the cycle we will then have data from faculty, internship supervisors and students that will enable us to make any necessary curriculum and/or program changes to close the loop on assessment. Results will be discussed and analyzed first among the journalism faculty and then presented to the NSC faculty at a faculty meeting or the August faculty workday. Any potential curriculum/program changes will be processed and circulated to the staff.

Relationship to Strategic Plan:

Assessment of the learning outcomes through these measures will link to the UCF's strategic plan of offering the best undergraduate education available in Florida and the journalism program's strategic plan and our primary goal of to provide a professional program that prepares students to work for the news media, especially websites, newspapers and magazines. Our professional oriented program will introduce and reinforce student learning in areas of communication, technical skills, research and critical thinking, necessary tools as our graduates engage in writing and editing. In addition to teaching students professional skills, the Journalism program also acquaints students with their historical heritage and with their legal and ethical rights and responsibilities. The portfolio guidelines will be updated in the next year and ethical guidelines will be added to address questions of integrity. Also, as the Nicholson School continues to explore collaboration with international programs, we will explore the possibility of internships abroad.

Top

Outcome: 1

Journalism graduates will demonstrate strong news judgment, i.e. the ability to recognize and gather news.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

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

Measure: 1.1

At least 90 percent of internship supervisors will express agreement with the statement: "The intern demonstrates good news judgment."

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

Intern supervisors agreed that ninety seven percent of the time (31 of 32) were rated good or above (five or higher) on a 10 point scale that their interns demonstrated good news judgment.

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 intern supervisors only agreed seventy seven percent of the time (24 of 31) that their interns demonstrated good news judgment. The improvement appears to be a result of the fact we have begun placing more emphasis on news judgement in the foundational news reporting class and perhaps more importantly have begun spending more time reviewing news judgement in upper level journalism classes.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 1.2

In evaluating graduation portfolios, the faculty will agree 90 percent of the time that "The stories display a range of content, demonstrating the ability to effectively cover a wide range of topics."

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

Target met. Ninety two percent of student portfolios (N=36) were judged as acceptable or better in terms of demonstrating the ability to effectively cover a wide range of topics.

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 ninety percent of students were rated as acceptable or better.

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).

Having good news judgment is one of the single most important attributes a journalist can possess.

Consequently, we are pleased to note that we met our target for both measures. We believe the improvement in this area is a result of new curriculum that we introduced in the 2015-2016 catalogue. Under the previous catalogue, students had more discretion in choosing which journalism skills courses they took. Anecdotally, we know that many students shied away from the very courses (such as Advanced Reporting) most likely to help them develop strong news judgment. Under the new catalogue, students are required to take Advanced Reporting as well as a new capstone journalism class. Although we are pleased to see improvement in this area, as a program we must continue to aim even higher. Therefore, we plan to revise this measure next cycle that the intern will demonstrate very good news judgement, rather than good news judgement (7 or higher, rather than 5 or higher).

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Outcome 1 is a great example of how identifying necessary curriculum changes can result in successful improvement of student scores. This change has allowed the program to close the loop on these measures from previous years. Congratulations on hitting this achievement and the programs readiness to increase the measure. In the future, it would be helpful to see the disaggregated data of student points in measure 1.1. It would also be helpful to have both the SPSS files, as well as excel or screenshot, if the SPSS files cannot be opened. TM 1/2/17

- Zack's notes 1/17/17
- Measure 1.1: Okay. Given the changes to the instrument versus the way the measure is written I understand the difficulty in reporting the results accurately and the confusion it may cause, so the results are sufficient. We would however like to see the disaggregate or granular data and some analysis. How many students scored and 10 out of 10, 9 out of 10, etc. Pretty good comparison to last year's data and explanation as to what may have caused the improvement.
- Measure 1.2: The way this is worded makes the N ambiguous. Is 36 the total number of student portfolios or the number that were rated acceptable? In addition to including the percentage of portfolios that were acceptable please also indicate the number in comparison to the total sample size. We really should have some more information either here or in the plan. How are the portfolios evaluated? what constitutes acceptable? We would also like to see some analysis and granular data. Are there any areas in which the students struggled in relation to this. I cannot open the SAV or SPV documents attached, and in the other portfolio documents attached I don't see a rubric item related to range of topic. I think this should be better explained in the

plan or here in the results.

- Reflective Statement: Great explanation as to what the program did to create improvement and why the program did it. Also good discussion of raising the bar going forward.

Attachments: assessment_methods15.docx internshipassessment.sav
assessmentportfoliooutput.spv JOU INTERNSHIP ASSESSMENT FORM 2011.pdf PORTFOLIO EVAL
FORM 2010.pdf PORTFOLIO.pdf

Top

Outcome: 2

Journalism graduates will use the English language with clarity and precision.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

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

Measure: 2.1

At least 90 percent of internship supervisors will rate the interns writing skills as good, very good or excellent.

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

Target met. Intern supervisors rated our students' writing as good (five or higher) ninety seven percent of the time (31 of 32). Sixty eight percent of our students were rated as very good or excellent. In fact, three students received a percent score in this category.

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

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

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

Last year, only eighty three percent of supervisors thought our students demonstrated good writing skills. This improvement appears to be a result of recent curriculum changes that gave students fewer choices while funneling them into more writing intensive courses.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed

☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 2.2

At least 90 percent of graduation portfolios will receive an average rating of "acceptable" (one a five-point scale where 1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = acceptable, 4 = good, and 5 = excellent) from three or more faculty members for the following item: The stories in the core news category show depth of reporting and quality writing.

Result:

Accurate and thorough data reporting means: a. Report data for all students or other constituents; b. Report data that matches data requirements established by a measure (i.e., your assessment must measure what you set out to measure); c. Report granular and aggregate results (e.g., subscale and total scores from a rubric or exam); d. Response rates are provided for survey data; e. The underlying "n" and "N" are provided for all percentage statistics and if a change score is provided the data points to support the score are included; f. Representative samples should include data from students at a distance (regional campuses or online/video) if courses are offered at these locations/through these modalities.

- ☒ Target met
☐ Target not met

Target met. One hundred percent of the of student portfolios (N=36) were judged as acceptable or better in terms of demonstrating the ability to effectively show depth of reporting and quality writing.

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, eighty seven percent of students had an average of three or higher.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 2.3

On the senior survey journalism program specific question "do you agree or disagree that you developed a mastery of basic journalism writing skills", 90 percent or more graduating seniors completing the survey will agree with the statement (by selecting agree or strongly agree).

Result:

Accurate and thorough data reporting means: a. Report data for all students or other constituents; b. Report data that matches data requirements established by a measure (i.e., your assessment must measure what you set out to measure); c. Report granular and aggregate results (e.g., subscale and total scores from a rubric or exam); d. Response rates are provided for survey data; e. The underlying "n" and "N" are provided for all percentage statistics and if a change score is provided the data points to support the score are included; f. Representative samples should include data from students at a distance (regional campuses or online/video) if courses are offered at these locations/through these modalities.

- ☐ Target met
- ☒ Target not met

Just eighty four percent of those completing the survey (22 of 26) expressed agreement with the idea that they had developed a mastery of basic journalism writing skill. Of those expressing agreement 14 strongly agreed and 8 agreed. The other respondents (4) were ambivalent, selecting the neutral option.

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:

As we switched to calendar year reporting and the senior survey only reports on academic year, our results are the same for this reporting cycle. However, curriculum changes in recent years (including requiring more writing courses under the new catalog) have placed more emphasis on writing, but it will likely take another year or two for the results to show up in the senior survey.

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).

To the extent we had some interns underwhelm their supervisors last year, we had put in place a couple things to alleviate this issue. The first was that we began asking supervisors to fill out a mid-semester evaluation form that alerts both students and their faculty adviser if there are problems that need to be addressed. We implemented this because several under performing interns told us that they weren't aware they weren't meeting expectations until their final evaluation. The faculty have also become acutely aware that sometimes a particular internship isn't a good fit for a particular student. When we considered how and why this happens, we realized that often the interns who struggle are the ones who weren't there supervisors first or second choice. This happens because demand for our interns is so high that in a rush to not get shut out, employers on campus at our twice yearly InternPursuit event often end up extending offers to students before the event has even concluded. This means that a) employers were making snap judgments without checking references and b) our students often felt pressured to accept an offer without enough time to consider all their options. To address these issues, we instituted a 48-hour cooling off period at our internship fair. Employers must wait two days after the event to extend an offer to anybody they've interviewed at the internship fair. These moves appear to have paid off.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☒ Revision or explanation needed
- ☐ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Another great example of how identifying necessary changes to internship practices resulted in successful improvement of student and employer satisfaction. While measure 2.3 was not met, the program was able to identify the reason for the results and will continue to monitor. Unfortunately when it comes to student survey satisfaction, it is often difficult to get an accurate measure on success. Student satisfaction will vary by graduating cohort and it could be that this measure is simply not obtainable. Would like to see this addressed in the reflective statement. Just like with outcome 1, it would be helpful to see the disaggregated data of student points in measures 2.1 and 2.2. It would also be helpful to have both the SPSS files, as well as excel or screenshot, if the SPSS files cannot be opened. TM 1/2/17

- Zack's notes 1/17/17
- Measure 2.1: Same comments as measure 1.1. Given the changes to the instrument versus the way the measure is written I understand the difficulty in reporting the results accurately and the confusion it may cause, so the results are sufficient. We would however like to see the disaggregate or granular data and some analysis. How many students scored and 10 out of 10, 9 out of 10, etc. Pretty good comparison to last year's data and explanation as to what may have caused the improvement.
- Measure 2.2: Because the result is 100% the N is not as confusing as it was in measure 1.2, but in the future, in addition to including the percentage of portfolios that were acceptable please also indicate the number in comparison to the total sample size. We would also like to see some analysis and granular data. Are there any areas in which the students struggled in relation to this. How many students scored acceptable, how many good, how many excellent? When comparing to previous years data there seems to be a pretty significant improvement in the results. What may have caused this?
- Measure 2.3: looks pretty good. Being that this is a survey, is there any anecdotal evidence provided by the 4 ambivalent students that might help the program find ways in which you might improve?
- Reflective Statement: Great reflection regarding the internships and measure 2.1 but nothing related to measure 2.2 and 2.3. In particular I would like to see some discussion as to what might have caused the improvement in measure 2.2.
- Attachments: as with outcome 1 the SPV and SAV files cannot be opened. Please attach PDF files.

Attachments: Graduating Seniors Survey Jou program specific.docx assessmentportfoliooutput.spv internshipassessment.sav assessment_methods15.docx PORTFOLIO.pdf JOU INTERNSHIP ASSESSMENT FORM 2011.pdf PORTFOLIO EVAL FORM 2010.pdf

Top

Outcome: 3

Journalism graduates will exhibit a mastery of grammar, punctuation, spelling, and Associated Press style.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

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

Measure: 3.1

At least 90 percent of internship supervisors will express agreement with the statement: "The intern demonstrates a good command of grammar, punctuation, and Associated Press (or house) style."

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

Target met. Ninety four percent of interns (30 of 32) were rated as good or higher. Twenty eight percent were rated as excellent.

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 only seventy four percent of supervisors thought our students demonstrated a good command of style and grammar. This improvement appears to be a result of recent curriculum changes that gave students fewer choices while funneling them into more writing and grammar intensive courses.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 3.2

On the senior survey journalism program specific question "do you agree or disagree that you developed a mastery of basic journalism editing skills", 90 percent or more graduating seniors completing the survey will agree with the statement (by selecting agree or strongly agree).

Result:

Accurate and thorough data reporting means: a. Report data for all students or other constituents; b. Report data that matches data requirements established by a measure (i.e., your assessment must measure what you set out to measure); c. Report granular and aggregate results (e.g., subscale and total scores from a rubric or exam); d. Response rates are provided for survey data; e. The underlying "n" and "N" are provided for all percentage statistics and if a change score is provided the data points to support the score are included; f. Representative samples should include data from students at a distance (regional campuses or online/video) if courses are offered at these locations/through these modalities.

- ☒ Target met
☐ Target not met

More than ninety two percent of those completing the survey (24 of 26) expressed agreement with the idea that they had developed a mastery of basic journalism editing skills. Of those expressing agreement 15 strongly agreed and 9 agreed. The other respondents (2) were ambivalent, selecting the neutral option.

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:

As we switched to calendar year reporting and the senior survey only reports on academic year, our results are the same for this reporting cycle.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Reflective Statement:

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

We are heartened to see that both students and intern supervisors believe we are imparting good editing skills. In the past there was a disconnect between the student measure and the internship measure, with intern supervisors being less impressed. The fact that we were able to close this gap appears to be a function of changing how we deal with internships. We began asking supervisors to fill out a mid-semester evaluation form that alerts both students and their faculty adviser if there are problems that need to be addressed. We implemented this because several under performing interns told us that they weren't aware they weren't meeting expectations until their final evaluation. This added evaluation encourages more communication between supervisors and interns and helps identify areas interns can work on before it's too late. The faculty have also become acutely aware that sometimes a particular internship isn't a good fit for a particular student. When we considered how and why this happens, we realized that often the interns who struggle are the ones who weren't there supervisors first or second choice. This happens because demand for our interns is so high that in a rush to not get shut out, employers on campus at our twice yearly InternPursuit event often end up extending offers to students before the event has even concluded. This means that a) employers are making snatch judgments without checking references and b) our students often feel pressured to accept an offer without enough time to consider all their options. To address these issues, starting at this fall's InternPursuit, we're instituting a 48-hour cooling off period. Employers must wait two days after the event to extend an offer to anybody they've interviewed at the internship fair. The changes appear to have been effective.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

While measure 3.2 did not reflect improvement from last year, this again is data from a student survey which will vary by graduating cohort. This type of student satisfaction is one that many programs face but despite its varying results, having student feedback is important for program success. It would be helpful to see the disaggregated data of student points in measures 3.1 and 3.2. It would also be helpful to have both the SPSS files, as well as excel or screenshot, if the SPSS files cannot be opened. Also, all PDF files within outcome 3 could not be loaded. Had to utilize files from outcome 1. TM 1/2/17

- Zack's notes 1/17/17

- Measure 3.1: This may be better corrected in the plan rather than the results, but we need to know what constitutes a rating of "good" this may be evident in the attachments, but again the SPSS attachments cannot be opened. You state that 28% were rated excellent what are the numbers for the other levels of evaluation? In comparing to previous year's data good explanation of what may have caused the improvement.
- Measure 3.2: looks pretty good. as with measure 2.3 since this is a survey is there any anecdotal feedback that might help the program create improvements in this area?
- Reflective statement: great explanation for the improvement related to the internships. We would also like to see some reflection for measure 3.2 as well.
- Attachments: the SPSS documents cannot be opened please attach PDF files.

Attachments: PORTFOLIO EVAL FORM 2010.pdf JOU INTERNSHIP ASSESSMENT FORM 2011.pdf
 PORTFOLIO.pdf assessment_methods15.docx internshipassessment.sav
 assessmentportfoliooutput.spv Graduating Seniors Survey Jou program specific.docx

Top

Outcome: 4

Graduates will demonstrate the ability to conduct journalistic research.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

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

Measure: 4.1

At least 90 percent of internship supervisors will rate the interns research skills as good, very good or excellent.

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

Target met. Ninety seven percent of student interns (31 of 32) were rated as good or better in this category.

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

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

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

Last year, ninety three percent of supervisors said our interns had good research skills. This

improvement appears to be a result of recent curriculum changes that gave students fewer choices while funneling them into more writing and research intensive courses.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 4.2

At least 90 percent of internship supervisors will rate the interns reporting skills as good, very good or excellent.

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

Target met. Ninety one percent of student interns (30 of 32) were rated as good or better. Twenty eight percent were rated as excellent.

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, ninety percent of supervisors agreed that our interns had "good" reporting skills.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 4.3

On the first destination survey where 1= very little and 7= very much, 90 percent or more graduating students completing the survey will select 5 or higher, for the question that asks "rate the extent your UCF experience contributed to your knowledge, skills and professional development in research."

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

All told, seventy percent four percent (28 of 38) of alumni completing the first destination survey rated their experience a 5 or higher. Of the 38 respondents 22 selected 7, 9 selected 6, 5 selected 5, 5 selected 4, 4 selected 3 and 1 selected 2.

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 eighty percent of respondents selected a 5 or higher, compared to seventy four percent this year. More alumni completed the survey this year.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Reflective Statement:

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

We are pleased to have met two of our three goals in this area. However, we are some what disappointed to learn that recent graduates felt there was room for improvement in this area. We have begun a dialogue with current and former students to get a better handle on the research skills they desire to have upon graduation. Once we have obtained this information, a big challenge will be to determine how best to incorporate new skills into the curriculum.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Congratulations again on identifying necessary curriculum changes that improved last year's target not met/shown improvement. With successes in the ninety percent, the program may consider a stretch target of raising the rating to be acquired to increase quality. See previous comments on the inclusion of disaggregated data and student surveys, as they also apply to outcome 4. TM 1/2/17

- Zack's notes 1/17/17
- Measure 4.1: Similar comments to previous similar measures. I think some revisions to the plan to include additional information about the measures is needed. For example we need to know what constitutes a rating of "good" this may be evident in the attachments, but again the SPSS attachments cannot be opened. We would like to see some granular/disaggregate data and analysis. How many scored excellent, good, etc. In comparing to previous year's data good explanation of what may have caused the improvement.
- Measure 4.2: similar comments to 4.1 and other similar measures.

- Measure 4.3: Results are sufficient. As with the other measures related to surveys, are there any anecdotal responses that might help the program find ways in which you might create improvement?
- Reflective Statement: We'd like to see a little reflection for measure 4.1 and 4.2.... Pretty good reflection for 4.3 related to the survey.

Attachments:[Top](#)**Outcome: 5**

Graduates will demonstrate a respect for deadlines and the ability to consistently meet them.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

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

Measure: 5.1

At least 90 percent of internship supervisors will rate the interns deadline responsibility as good, very good or excellent.

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

Target not met. Only eighty seven percent of students (27 of 31) were rated as good or better.

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 only eighty three percent of internship supervisors agreed that their interns met deadlines. This improvement is likely a function of increased emphasis on deadline writing in the foundational news reporting class as well as other upper level reporting classes. However, this remains an area where there is room for additional improvement.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 5.2

At least 95 percent of students in News Reporting will demonstrate the ability to complete a timed writing assignment under a tight deadline (25 minutes or less). On or near the final day of class, the instructor of each section of News Reporting will provide students with a fact sheet and give them 25 minutes or less to complete the story. Instructors will report to the Area Coordinator the number of students who began the assignment and the number who completed it in the required amount of time while meeting minimum expectations for story length and accuracy.

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

Target not met. We only have partial data for this reporting cycle, as we had a couple of adjunct instructors who did not report their data and are no longer with the University. However, there's no reason to believe that the other sections would have performed at such a high level as to allow us to meet our goal.

Based on the reported data, only seventy four (28 out of the 38 students) successfully completed a timed writing assignment. Therefore, the target was not met. Performance by section (taught by two different instructors) varied significantly, with eighty percent of students successfully completing the task in one section and sixty seven percent in the other.

The nature of the measure being a one-shot approach may make it difficult to reach the ninety five percent goal as some of the students who didn't succeed on the assignment were among the top performers over the course of the semester and apparently had a bad day. The nature of the assignment is that a single mistake can be the difference between success and failure. But having said all that, this is clearly an area where we need to improve. Recent attempts to standardize the news reporting curriculum will presumably help. However, we may also need to take a closer look at the number of timed writing assignments students are doing in each section and consider whether that number needs to be increased.

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:

In the 2014 cycle only seventy three percent of our students (24 of 33) met our expectations on this assignment. Although this cycle there was only a one percent increase, as we begin to implement planned changes to standardize the curriculum we should see greater improvement.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Reflective Statement:

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

This outcome is the one that we as a faculty are most disappointed to see. Meeting deadlines is a crucial skill for all journalists and yet whether this ability is measured by the faculty or by internship supervisors, too many of our students appear to be lacking in this area. Consequently, this is an area that will receive more attention moving forward. We plan to add an additional measure that will allow us to measure the ability to meet deadlines in intermediate courses. This addition will a) allow us to track deadline writing ability at various times in a student's career and b) place a greater emphasis on deadline writing throughout the curriculum. One thing we are keeping an eye on is that having moved to more mixed mode courses in recent years may have cut down on in class writing exercises that stress the ability to meet a tight deadline. Although it will take some time to implement, we are discussing scheduling mixed mode courses in such a way that instructors have more control over how much time students spend in class.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

See previous comment on the inclusion of a disaggregated breakdown of evaluation scores. Has the program considered moving up the date of the timed writing assignment in measure 5.2 to earlier in the semester. This might increase adjunct data reporting, as they are not working against final grade submission. Also, it is often that those not teaching in the following semester are not as responsive after they submit final grades. Moving up this assignment may provide the area coordinators more time to obtain the data needed for measure 5.2. See previous comments on SPSS files accessibility and PDF files. TM 1/2/17

- Zack's notes 1/17/17
- Measure 5.1: Similar comments to previous similar measures. I think some revisions to the plan to include additional information about the measures is needed. For example we need to know what constitutes a rating of "good" this may be evident in the attachments, but again the SPSS attachments cannot be opened. We would like to see some granular/disaggregate data and analysis. How many scored excellent, good, etc. In comparing to previous year's data good explanation of what may have caused the improvement. You also note that there is room for additional improvement. Some discussion of what the program might do to create that improvement would be great.
- Measure 5.2: I think this is a very good example of a well written thoroughly explained measure and thoroughly reported results. The only other analysis I would like to see from included here is of the 10 students who did not successfully complete the assignment, what caused them to fail? Did they run out of time? Did they miss key minimum expectations? too short? too many mistakes? etc. You discuss some great planned changes of standardizing curriculum to improve student learning and maybe including multiple timed assignments to improve data collection.
- Reflective Statment: pretty good reflective statement. Ideally I would like to see the discussion of the standardized curriculum and additional timed assignments included again here as well as in the discussion for the measure.

Attachments: PORTFOLIO EVAL FORM 2010.pdf JOU INTERNSHIP ASSESSMENT FORM 2011.pdf
 PORTFOLIO.pdf assessment_methods15.docx internshipassessment.sav
 assessmentportfoliooutput.spv First Destination Survey Journalism form.xlsx

Top

Outcome: 6

Graduates will understand the importance of accuracy and demonstrate an ability to practice it.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

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

Measure: 6.1

At least 90 percent of internship supervisors will rate the interns accuracy of work as good, very good or excellent.

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

Missed expectations. Eighty seven percent of students (29 of 32) were rated a 5 or higher (out of 10) with 5 representing good, 7 representing very good, and nine representing excellent.

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 ninety percent of internship of supervisors (27 of 31) said their interns did a "good" job or better job of being accurate. This modest decline is likely a function of the changing nature of the work interns are being asked to perform. Interns are being asked to do more, thus increasing the opportunity to make mistakes. Clearly this is an area that will need to receive greater attention moving forward.

Review:

- ☒ Revision or explanation needed
- ☐ Satisfactory

Measure: 6.2

At least 90 percent of graduation portfolios will receive an average rating of "acceptable" (on a five-point scale where 1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = acceptable, 4 = good, and 5 = excellent) from three or more faculty members for the following item: The published items contain few errors.

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

Target met. Ninety seven percent of the student portfolios (N=36) were rated as acceptable or better in terms of accuracy.

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, ninety seven percent of students (31 of 32) had an average rating of a 3.0 or higher on portfolios.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Reflective Statement:

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

We are disappointed to have seen some backsliding this year in this area, which is one in which we have historically excelled. Whether this is a one year aboration or an actual trend is something we will be watching for closely. The launch of NSM today (our online student news website) and the fact that a large amount of the websites content comes from our classes means that students are getting more first-hand experience that drives home the importance of accuracy. They no longer simply face the prospect of failing an assignment for a factual error but they also face potential public embarrassment. We are hopeful that such real world lessons will reinforce the importance of accuracy and help us to return to a previous higher level of performance in this area.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Please address any plans, or first steps, at addressing the unsatisfactory decline in Measure 6.1 over

the past two assessments. The granular breakdown provided in measure 6.1 does not appear to match total responses. And granular data should be included for measure 6.2. With the launch of NSM and the importance of real world lessons, the program may consider using articles student publish for measure 6.2. See previous comments on SPSS and PDF accessibility. TM 1/2/17

- Zack's notes 1/17/17
- Measure 6.1: Similar comments to previous similar measures. I think some revisions to the plan to include additional information about the measures is needed. We would like to see some granular/disaggregate data and analysis. How many scored excellent, good, etc. In comparing to previous year's data pretty good job of explaining what may have contributed to the decline, but we'd also like to see some discussion of what the program might do to create improvement going forward.
- Measure 6.2: Similar comments to previous similar measures. include both the number and percent of acceptable portfolios. Given the high results and the fact that the are the same as last year it is understandable that there is little discussion and analysis.
- Reflective Statement: pretty good reflective statement.

Attachments: assessmentportfoliooutput.spv internshipassessment.sav
assessment_methods15.docx PORTFOLIO.pdf JOU INTERNSHIP ASSESSMENT FORM 2011.pdf
PORTFOLIO EVAL FORM 2010.pdf

Top

Outcome: 7

Journalism graduates will demonstrate the ability to develop compelling story ideas as well as to tell compelling journalistic stories through an appropriate medium (i.e. photos, words, graphics, etc.)

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

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

Measure: 7.1

At least 90 percent of internship supervisors will express agreement with the statement: "The intern met or exceeded our expectations in terms of developing and pitching story ideas."

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

Target not met. Only sixty nine percent of student interns (26 of 32) were rated as good or better in this category.

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

- ☒ Yes

☐ No

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

Last year, only fifty three percent of supervisors said students met or exceeded their expectations for pitching stories. Although there remains significant room for improvement, recent gains suggest that a greater emphasis on pitching stories in the foundational news reporting class as well as upper level classes appears to be paying dividends.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 7.2

At least 90 percent of internship supervisors will express agreement with the statement: "The intern demonstrated the ability to tell compelling journalistic stories through an appropriate medium (i.e. photos, words, graphics, etc.)."

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

Target met. Ninety percent of students (28 of 31) were rated as good or better in this category.

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

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

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

Only eighty three percent of supervisors (20 of 29) agreed that their interns demonstrated the ability to tell compelling stories. This improvement reflects recent changes in curriculum that funnel student into classes with greater demands via storytelling.

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).

Getting our students to develop their own story ideas and then tell those stories in a creative way has long been a challenge. We certainly teach these things in all our skills courses, but it isn't necessarily something students always demonstrate inside or outside of class. We are cautiously optimistic that requiring two courses (Advanced Reporting and the capstone course) that will be run as newsrooms will help dramatically in this area. We are pleased to see some progress but will continue to monitor the situation.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

While the target was not met for measure 7.1, the improvement over last years does suggest that the implemented curriculum changes are successful. With its continued emphasis in the classroom, this measure can easily be closed within the next two assessment cycles. See previous comments on granular data, and file accessibility. TM 1/2/17

- Zack's notes 1/17/17
- Measure 7.1: Similar comments to previous similar measures. I think some revisions to the plan to include additional information about the measures is needed. For example we need to know what constitutes a rating of "good" this may be evident in the attachments, but again the SPSS attachments cannot be opened. We would like to see some granular/disaggregate data and analysis. How many scored excellent, good, etc. In comparing to previous year's data good explanation of what may have caused the improvement. You also note that there is room for additional improvement. Some discussion of what the program might do to create that improvement would be great.
- Measure 7.2: Similar comments to previous similar measures. I think some revisions to the plan to include additional information about the measures is needed. For example we need to know what constitutes a rating of "good" this may be evident in the attachments, but again the SPSS attachments cannot be opened. We would like to see some granular/disaggregate data and analysis. How many scored excellent, good, etc. In comparing to previous year's data good explanation of what may have caused the improvement.
- Reflective Statement: good reflection.

Attachments: PORTFOLIO EVAL FORM 2010.pdf JOU INTERNSHIP ASSESSMENT FORM 2011.pdf
PORTFOLIO.pdf assessment_methods15.docx internshipassessment.sav
assessmentportfoliooutput.spv

Top

Outcome: 8

Journalism students will demonstrate an understanding of professional and ethical standards, and act accordingly.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

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

Measure: 8.1

At least 90 percent of internship supervisors will express agreement with the statement: "The intern

behaves ethically.”

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

Target met. All student interns (32 of 32) were rated as very good (7) or higher. Forty four percent of students received the highest possible rating (10).

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, ninety one percent of interns received an acceptable ranking. This improvement in an area that was already a strength reflects a continued emphasis on ethical decision making throughout the curriculum.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 8.2

Recognizing that “professionalism” encompasses numerous aspects, seven items (listed below) from the internship assessment form will be combined into an overall scale of professionalism. At least 90 percent of students will have an average of eight or higher on a ten-point scale, where one represents poor and ten represents excellent. The attributes that supervisors will be asked to respond are as follows: The overall quality of work, quantity of work, initiative, collegiality, creativity, attitude toward work, and adaptability/flexibility.

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

Target not met. Only forty seven percent of students (15 of 32) had an average score of 8 or higher on the professionalism scale. It should be noted that this is a (stretch goal) and that ninety percent of students had an average of 5 or higher, which represents a "good" rating.

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:

There was a slight decline from last year. It is too early to tell but it is possible this change is a reflection of the fact greater demands than ever are being placed on interns. Moving forward we will need to redouble our efforts to emphasize the importance of professionalism and of understanding and meeting the expectations of ones organization.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 8.3

On the senior survey journalism program specific question "do you agree or disagree that you developed an adequate understanding of the field's ethics", 90 percent or more graduating seniors completing the survey will agree with the statement (by selecting agree or strongly agree).

Result:

Accurate and thorough data reporting means: a. Report data for all students or other constituents; b. Report data that matches data requirements established by a measure (i.e., your assessment must measure what you set out to measure); c. Report granular and aggregate results (e.g., subscale and total scores from a rubric or exam); d. Response rates are provided for survey data; e. The underlying "n" and "N" are provided for all percentage statistics and if a change score is provided the data points to support the score are included; f. Representative samples should include data from students at a distance (regional campuses or online/video) if courses are offered at these locations/through these modalities.

- ☒ Target met
☐ Target not met

More than ninety six percent of those completing the survey (25 of 26) expressed agreement with the idea that they had developed an adequate understanding of journalism ethics. Of those expressing agreement 18 strongly agreed and 7 agreed. The other respondent selected the neutral option.

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:

As we switched to calendar year reporting and the senior survey only reports on academic year, our results are the same for this reporting cycle.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed

☒ Satisfactory

Reflective Statement:

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

We are pleased to see that our students continue to have a strong grasp of ethics but we recognize that we have our work cut out for us in terms of producing students with a high degree of professionalism, broadly defined. We are optimistic that when it comes to developing a broader sense of professionalism, having two different required courses (Advanced Reporting and the capstone) that force students to behave as though they are part of a newsroom will go a long way toward developing a more professional culture.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Congratulations on the achievement in measure 8.1. With such high percentage of success over the last two years, the program may consider updating this measure towards a new stretch target. As measure 8.2 was a stretch target from last year, the program may consider lowering the percentage slightly to a more realistic improvement. See previous comments on granular data and file accessibility. TM 1/2/17

- Zack's notes 1/17/17
- Measure 8.1: Similar comments to previous similar measures. I think some revisions to the plan to include additional information about the measures is needed. We would like to see some granular/disaggregate data and analysis. How many scored excellent, good, etc.
- Measure 8.2: pretty good. We would like to see some disaggregate/granular data how many students averaged a score of 5, 6, 7, etc. Also, and probably more importantly it would be interesting to look at the disaggregate data for the seven areas assessed. Are there any of those areas in which students seemed to struggle more than others? For example do students rate better on quantity of work that they do on quality of work? Do they tend to score lower on initiative or attitude? etc. Examining these subscales will likely provide to program with useful information for the areas in which improvement can occur.
- Measure 8.3: looks pretty good.
- Reflective Statement: pretty good reflective statement. as mentioned above if you examine some of the subscales it might allow you to get more specific about what the program can improve upon and how you may go about creating that improvement.

Attachments: assessmentportfoliooutput.spv internshipassessment.sav
assessment_methods15.docx PORTFOLIO.pdf JOU INTERNSHIP ASSESSMENT FORM 2011.pdf
PORTFOLIO EVAL FORM 2010.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:

The methods in place are appropriate for the outcomes of this assessment. The program may consider utilizing a department graduation/alumni survey. These types of surveys are used by other programs who have expressed greater return

Explain EACH item checked above:

Assessment is conducted by the journalism faculty and the data comes from three primary places, faculty review and evaluation of portfolios, internship supervisor evaluations and student surveys. 1. Portfolios: All students are required to submit a portfolio that includes at least ten published work samples the semester prior to graduation. No fewer than three faculty members review each portfolio. 2. Internship supervisor evaluations: All students enrolled in internships must have had their internship supervisor submit an evaluation form to receive credit for the course. 3. We have a couple of measures that look at specific questions from the graduating senior survey and first destination survey.

success rate over the university surveys. Due to the accessibility issues of both the SPSS files and the PDF files starting with outcome 3, would like to see these documents uploaded again. TM 1/2/17

- Zack's notes 1/17/17
- This section seems pretty good. As the reviewer mentions the attachments need some attention.
- One other note for this section. Ideally, in the explanation sections we like to see 1) what instrument is used 2) what measure(s) it is used for 3) and what information is assessed using the instrument. just something to keep in mind for future reports.

Examinations/Tests:**Standardized:**

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

Explain EACH item checked above:**Local:**

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

Explain EACH item checked above:**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:**Local:**

- ☒ Alumni Survey (Department or Program; not UCF)
- ☐ Customer Satisfaction Survey

- ☐ Exit and Other Interviews

Explain EACH item checked above:

Other Survey(s):

- ☐ National Survey
☐ State Survey
☒ Other Survey

Explain EACH item checked above:

Miscellaneous Assessment Methods:

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

Explain EACH item checked above:

Changes to Academic Process:

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

Our current data collection process is in place, this cycle we focused on curriculum.

Changes to Curriculum:

- ☐ Revise and/or Enforce Prerequisites
☐ Revise Course Sequence
☐ Revise Course Content
☐ Add Course
☐ Delete Course
☒ Other implemented or planned change

Is this an implemented or planned change?

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:

Throughout the assessment, reference to changes to several curriculum changes (such as Advanced Reporting) were indicated. However specifics were not provided. It would be helpful to note the changes that assisted with the improved scores. While outcome 2 changes were not updated on the improvement tab, they are addressed in the results section. TM 1/2/17

- ☒ Implemented Change
- ☐ Planned Change
- ☐ Both

Implemented change in current assessment cycle:

The information you see below has been taken from your own plan and results for the current assessment cycle. This means you must complete the results and reflective statement in the previous tab before you go on to edit and complete the section below.

Strategy - Intentional actions that bring about change. How did you bring about a change?

Outcome: 2 Measure: 1

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

Many of the improvements this cycle are a function of previous years assessment and curriculum changes that began to be implemented in the 2014-15 catalog. Specifically students went from having broad discretion to choose a wide variety of courses to a system that required they take a greater number of writing/reporting intensive courses, including advanced reporting and either multimedia journalism or online journalism. We anticipate continued improvement as more students take the newly required capstone course. The changes that were made are beginning to show in this year's results.

Describe the data that you collected to assess the change:

Target met. Intern supervisor evaluations rated our students' writing as good (five or higher) ninety seven percent of the time (31 of 32).

Describe Improvement(s):

(If baseline data or no improvement, please explain next steps)
Intern supervisor evaluations rated our students' writing as good (five or higher) ninety seven percent of the time (31 of 32). Last year only eighty three percent of the students were rated as good (25 of 30) on their writing skills by intern supervisors. This year sixty eight percent of our students were rated as very good or excellent. In fact, three students received a percent score in this category compared to only one last year. The curriculum changes that now require students to take a greater number of intensive writing/reporting courses seems to be improving students' writing skills.

☐ No Changes to Curriculum

Changes to Assessment Plan:

- ☐ Revise Student Outcome Statement
- ☒ Revise Measurement Approach

This selection can only be a planned change

- ☒ Planned Change

Planned change for next assessment cycle:

- Zack's notes 1/17/17
- I agree with the reviewer. I think there are more examples of both implemented and planned changes that were mentioned throughout the report that should also be addressed here.
- For future reports remember to use this section as the place to provide evidence of "closing the loop" to close the loop remember we need to 1) Use past assessment to identify an area that can be improved. 2) Make a change to the program that is intended to create the improvement 3) collect data to see if the change was effective. 4) If we see improvement and can point to the change as a contributing factor for the improvement then we have "closed the loop"

The information you see below has been taken from your own plan and results for the current assessment cycle. This means you must complete the results and reflective statement in the previous tab before you go on to edit and complete the section below.

Strategy - Intentional actions that bring about change. How are you going to bring about a change?

Outcome: 5 Measure:

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

This outcome is the one that we as a faculty are most disappointed to see. Meeting deadlines is a crucial skill for all journalists and yet whether this ability is measured by the faculty or by internship supervisors, too many of our students appear to be lacking in this area. Consequently, this is an area that will receive more attention moving forward. We have added an additional outcome that will allow us to measure the ability to meet deadlines in intermediate courses. This addition will a) allow us to track deadline writing ability at various times in a student's career and b) place a greater emphasis on deadline writing throughout the curriculum. One thing we are keeping an eye on is that having moved to more mixed mode courses in recent years may have cut down on in class writing exercises that stress the ability to meet a tight deadline.

Although it will take some time to implement, we are discussing scheduling mixed mode courses in such a way that instructors have more control over how much time students spend in class.

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

Target not met. We only have partial data for this reporting cycle, as we had a couple of adjunct instructors who did not report their data and are no longer with the University. However, there's no reason to believe that the other sections would have performed at such a high level as to allow us to meet our goal.

Based on the reported data, only seventy four (28 out of the 38 students) successfully completed a timed writing assignment.

Therefore, the target was not met. Performance by section (taught by two different instructors) varied significantly, with eighty percent of students successfully completing the task in one section and sixty seven percent in the other.

The nature of the measure being a one-shot approach may make it difficult to reach the ninety five percent goal as some of the students who didn't succeed on the assignment were among the top performers over the course of the semester and apparently had a bad day. The nature of the assignment is that a single mistake can be the difference between success and failure. But having said all that, this is clearly an area where we need to improve. Recent attempts to standardize the news reporting curriculum will presumably help. However, we may also need to take a closer look at the number of timed writing assignments students are doing in each section and consider whether that number needs to be increased. We plan to incorporate another measure into the plan to collect and analyze data from intermediate courses to give us a perspective across the curriculum.

- ☐ 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

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).

The curriculum introduced in 2015-16 catalog (which included more intensive required writing/reporting courses and the additional capstone course) was motivated in large part by a desire to address issues identified year after year in our assessment data. We are beginning to see some of those changes show improvement in the students' ability to demonstrate good news judgement and improvement in writing skills (as reflected in outcomes one and two, measures one and two). While we are pleased with the improvements in these areas, we must continue to aim higher. We plan to make changes to this year's plan for measure 1.1 to raise the bar on students' ability to demonstrate to intern supervisors good news judgement from "good" to "very good." This next cycle we will continue to emphasize good writing skills and focus more attention on meeting deadlines across the curriculum.

Review Criteria:

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

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Review:

Congratulations on an overall successful assessment and improvement to the Journalism BA program. Area coordinators successfully identified needs of the program which allowed for closed loops. There are a couple of places where success has been noted over the last two assessments, and the program has room for new stretch goals. Despite accessibility issues with some of the files, I was able to reference the documents attached to earlier outcomes and met that indicator as successful. TM 1/2/17

- Zack's notes 1/17/17
- Overall the results report is rated 2-Emerging. Unfortunately, this is a mechanism of the rating system and not necessarily an accurate reflection of the actual report.
- I did not give credit for rubric item #2 related to accurate and thorough results. throughout the report there were many measures in which we would like to see granular/disaggregate data and some additional discussion/analysis.
- Unfortunately, because #2 is not checked the system will not allow us to give credit for rubric items #7 and #8. These two items are related to closing the loop and while I would also like to see more in this area (as evident by comments in the report) I think the program did a pretty good job of explaining what previous changes contributing to changes in results and what planned changes the program is considering to create improvement moving

forward.

- Overall, I think the report is quite good, but both the plan and results would benefit from more detail.

Site maintained by Operational Excellence and Assessment Support

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