UCF Assessment

Assessment Plan and Results

Plan Year:	**2017-2018 ▼**	Status: Plan Approved for DRC Report
Program/Unit:	Communication - M.A. ▼	Last Updated: 11/22/2017 2:39:03 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 Plan Review 🔴   2016-2017 Plan Review

Program/Unit:	Communication - M.A.	DRC:	College of Sciences
Year:	2017-2018	DRC Chair:	Elizabeth Grauerholz
Due Date:		Coordinator(s):	Harry Weger, Kim Tuorto, Lindsay Neuberger
		Reviewer(s):	Amy Donley

Quick Links: [Click here to enter Results Report]

Mission:

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

The Communication M.A. Program is dedicated to serving its stakeholders who are comprised of students, faculty, 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 graduate education in Mass and Interpersonal Communication; to mentor students in the conduct of research and creative activities; to provide the program's students with the educational development that will enhance the intellectual, cultural, environmental, and economic development of the metropolitan region; to develop students' academic and professional competencies; to establish UCF as a major presence in local and global communication related professional and academic communities; and to, thereby, support the mission and vision of the University of Central Florida as a whole.

Assessment Process:

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

The assessment process is designed to measure student competencies using direct and indirect assessments of student learning of academic, research, and professional skills. The plan includes direct measures of student competencies in the areas of theory, methodology, preparedness for doctoral work, critical thinking, and communication skills. Students' competencies are measured by evaluating specific sections of their theses (completed in the immediately previous fall, spring, and summer semesters) or by evaluating responses to specific comprehensive exam questions (completed in the immediate fall, spring, and summer semesters) addressing quantitative research methods, qualitative research methods, or communication theory; through surveys administered online; and through supervisors' assessments of students' workplace communication skills. Theses and comprehensive exam responses are evaluated by a panel of faculty members using a rubric. Reviews of exam

responses occur in the first two weeks of the fall semester. Reviews of theses occur at the time of the thesis defense. Indirect measures of preparedness for doctoral work and relevance of the program to professional career settings are measured using an online survey of recently graduated students administered in late August or early September.

Relationship to Strategic Plan:

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

Outcomes 1, 2, and 3, are all related to the strategic iniative aimed at improving graduate level education by assessing student knowledge of literature in the field and methods of inquiry.

Outcome 4 deals with preparing students for graduate education beyond UCF in our field. Measure 4.4 specifically deals with research produced by students which relates both to the strategic iniative above and the iniative dealing with scholarly research.

Mission, Process & Strategic Plan Comments:

Excellent discussion of the mission, the assessment process, and connection to the strategic plan. AD 11/5

- Zack's notes 11/17/17
- Mission:
    - looks pretty good.
- Assessment Process:
    - This section does a good job of addressing some of the prompt questions in blue text, but there are some that I would like to see addessed still or more clearly. This section covers well the questions of "What do you want to assess?" and "How do you plan to assess it?"... I would like to see "Who is conducting the assessment?", "What are they doing?", "How will you review and analyze the data?", "How are you going to use the assessment results to improve your program/unit?" and "How will you communicate the results to other faculty or staff members?" all addressed further.
    - I'll give the same suggestion that I give to all assessment coordinators for this section. If you just adress the prompt questions in blue text one by one, this section will be perfect.
- Relationship to Strategic Plan:
    - This section is sufficient. Soon we will want to start making more explicit connections to specific metrics within the UCF collective impact plan, so just keep that in mind for future plans.

Please consider the following:

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

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Top

Outcome: 1

Graduates will demonstrate skill as a writer at the graduate level.

Measure: 1.1

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

similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

At least 80% of students will score above satisfactory or satisfactory in each of four areas: precision, organization, use of grammar, and language usage. Data will be gathered from students' term paper for the course Mass Communication Theory or Theories of Public Relations.

Rubric for measure 2.1 is attached below.

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window 2016-2017 Results, Reflective Statements & Planned Changes)

◉ Yes

◯ No

Specify prior year's results:
Communication - M.A.

☐ 1.1	☐ 2.2	☐ 3.1	☐ 3.3	☑ 4.1	☐ 5.1
☐ 1.2	☐ 2.3	☐ 3.2	☐ 3.4	☐ 4.3	☐ 5.2
☐ 2.1					

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:
We are strengthening writing instruction in both the Proseminar course and the newly revised Theory course in hopes of improving the score from last year.

Measure: 1.2
Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

90% of students will respond "strongly agree" or "agree" to the following survey item: "Completing the NSC Communication M.A. program improved my writing skill." Data will be gathered using an online survey and three year rolling averages will be reported. The link to the survey will be sent out by the assessment coordinator in March of each year. The survey will be sent to students who graduated in the previous calendar year. A rolling three year average will be reported. The survey is attached below.

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window 2016-2017 Results, Reflective Statements & Planned Changes)

◯ Yes

◉ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:
This item is an attempt to triangulate our data gathered from writing samples and to assess students' affective learning. The measure was not created specifically to measure a change in our program or curriculum.

Outcome & Measures Review:

◯ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Outcome & Measures Comment:

No changes are planned for the three measures for Outcome 1. All targets are high (905) and it is not recommended that they be stretched. AD 11/5

- Zack's notes 11/17/17
- ***You must include 1 DIRECT measure to go with this outcome. Currently all 3 measures are self-perception indirect measures.***
    - Perhaps the survey could include a question about doctoral program acceptance, and your measure could be something like "X% of students who apply to a doctoral program will be accepted."
    - Self-perception survey questions are indirect measures.
- Outcome 1:
    - Outcome statement is fine. I might recommend wording it to be slightly more specific. instead of "life after graduation", perhaps you could say students will be prepared for "a doctoral program or employment in the discipline."... A lot of things unrelated to their MA could fall under "life" after graduation.
- Measure 1.1:
    - The premise for the measure is good. It could use a little "tightening up" though.
        - The measure just says "graduates", is this survey sent to all graduates of the program dating back as far as you can go? Is it only given to newly graduated students? Is it only sent to graduates from within the past X number of years? Please be more specific about who is asked to complete the survey.
        - The attached survey is from 2014, it would be beneficial to attach a more recent copy.
        - The measure says they survey respondants will report "satisfied or highly satisfied" preparation. In looking at the attachment it seems like question 5 cooresponds with this measure and it doesn't ask for a satisfaction rating, the choices are "very well prepared, adequately prepared, or poorly prepared". The survey options don't seem to coorespond with the measure options. This may just be because an old survey is attached. Please address this, but uploading a more recent survey that matches the measure, or changing the measure to match the survey.
- Measure 1.2:
    - Similar to 1.1 I don't see a question on the survey that directly cooresponds with this measure. Please attach an updated survey that matches or adjust the measure accordingly.
    - Similar to 1.1, who is asked to complete this survey and when? (the measure says students but it is asking about their current job, so shouldn't it say graduates, and is it sent to all gradutes, those who just graduated, those who graduated X number of years ago?)
- Measure 1.3:
    - Pretty good. The survey matches with this measure.
    - As with the previous measures we would just like to know who receives this survey and when.
- Attachments:
    - It looks like an updated version of the survey should be attached.

- Zack's notes 11/22/17
- *****Upon revision of plan, outcome 1 was removed and all the outcomes were renumbered to adjust for this. However, previous comments did not move with the renumbered outcomes, so the comments from the reviewer and my comments from 11/17/17 don't match with the outcomes anymore. The comments under outcome 1 no longer apply. The comments under outcome 2 belong to outcome 1, comments under 3 belong with 2, etc.*****
- Original outcome 1 was removed.
- New Outcome 1 (formerly outcome 2): It looks like requested revisions have been made. I'm still a little unclear about the scoring for measure 1.1. The measure says students will be above satisfactory or satisfactory, but the rubric uses a "high", "average", or "low" competency scale.

I'm assuming High = above satisfactory and average = satisfactory? In future plans please revise the language so that the measure and rubric match. The survey information was revised and the attachment included as requested.

Attachments: Writing assessment form 17.docx   Alumni Assessment Survey 17.docx

Outcome: 2

Students will demonstrate ability to explain, critique, and apply communication theory in a broad range of situations and contexts.

Measure: 2.1

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

In the course MMC6402 Mass Communication Theory, 80% of students will receive a rating of "above satisfactory" or "satisfactory" from their instructor on their responses to the following exam items: 1. Explain the fundamental principles/constructs of a particular communication theory 2. Identify evidence in support of the theory 3. Identify strengths and weaknesses of the theory. Above Satisfactory = full credit Satisfactory = passing credit Below Satisfactory = failing

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window 2016-2017 Results, Reflective Statements & Planned Changes)

○ Yes

◉ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:
We have changed our assessment method for this outcome, not in response to last year's results, but to make reporting easier for the course instructor and the assessment coordinator.

Measure: 2.2

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

In an alumni survey, 90% of students will agree or strongly agree with the following statement "I developed a strong foundation in a wide variety of communication theories as a student in the NSC MA program." Data will be gathered using an online survey and three year rolling averages will be reported. The link to the survey will be sent out by the assessment coordinator in March of each year. The survey will be sent to students who graduated in the previous calendar year. A rolling three year average will be reported. The survey is attached to outcome 1 above.

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window 2016-2017 Results, Reflective Statements & Planned Changes)

○ Yes

◉ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:
We wanted an indirect measure of the outcome to help triangulate our data. This measure is not in response to last year's results.

Outcome & Measures Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Outcome & Measures Comment:
Measure 2.1 reflects the use of assessment results in revising assessment goals and, more importantly, in changes in the curriculum designed to increase student learning outcomes. Please attach the survey used to asess Measure 2.2 AD 11/5

- Zack's notes 11/20/17
- Outcome 2:
    ○ Outcome statement is pretty good.
- Measure 2.1:
    ○ Measure is pretty good. I'm a little unsure about the rubric. What constitutes "above satisfactory" or "satisfactory"? Does the instructor just write in "satisfactory" what are the other possible ratings a student can receive?
    ○ Pretty good explanation of the change being made that will affect this measure.
- Measure 2.2:
    ○ The measure is pretty good.
    ○ When is the survey completed?
- Attachments:
    ○ Please attach the survey used for measure 2.2

- Zack's notes 11/22/17
- Outcome 2: (formerly outcome 3) Looks good. It appears that requested revisions were made.

Attachments: Communication Theory Exam Question Used for Assessment.docx

                                                                                                    Top

Outcome: 3
Students will be able to describe, use, and evaluate Communication research methodologies.

Measure: 3.1
Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

On an exam in the course COM5312 Introduction to Research Methods, 90% of students will be able to identify at least one strength and one weaknesses in one quantitative and one qualitative research methodology.

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window 2016-2017 Results, Reflective Statements & Planned Changes)

◉ Yes

○ No

Specify prior year's results:
Communication - M.A.

☐ 1.1   ☑ 2.2   ☐ 3.1   ☐ 3.3   ☐ 4.1   ☐ 5.1
☐ 1.2   ☑ 2.3   ☐ 3.2   ☐ 3.4   ☐ 4.3   ☐ 5.2
☑ 2.1

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:
In our on-going issue with students' failing to meet our targets we have implemented a new, more basic, research methods course to get the ready for the more advanced courses. In response, we have also revised outcomes for the course and program. This item assesses those changes.

Measure: 3.2

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

On an exam in COM5312, 90% of our students will be able to identify at least two differences between quantitative and qualitative approaches to the study of Communication.

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window 2016-2017 Results, Reflective Statements & Planned Changes)

◉ Yes
◯ No

Specify prior year's results:
Communication - M.A.

☐ 1.1   ☑ 2.2   ☐ 3.1   ☐ 3.3   ☐ 4.1   ☐ 5.1
☐ 1.2   ☑ 2.3   ☐ 3.2   ☐ 3.4   ☐ 4.3   ☐ 5.2
☑ 2.1

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:
In our on-going issue with students' failing to meet our targets we have implemented a new, more basic, research methods course to get the ready for the more advanced courses. In response, we have also revised outcomes for the course and program. This item assesses those changes.

Measure: 3.3

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

80%of students' theses will be judged above satisfactory on all of the following elements:
Methodology is appropriate to research question(s).
Quantitative/qualitative tools are utilized effectively.
Methodology produces sufficient evidence to address research question.
Student identifies weaknesses/tradeoffs in her/his methodology compared to other possible methodologies.
Rating scale: Above Satisfactory: Satisfactory: Below Satisfactory

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window 2016-2017 Results, Reflective Statements & Planned Changes)

○ Yes

⦿ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:
We typically do well on this measure, we have simply raised the bar from 100% being at least satisfactory to 80% being above satisfactory on all elements.

Measure: 3.4

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

At least 60% of graduates from the NSC MA Graduate Program in Communication will say they have participated in producing research that is presented at a conference or published in a journal in response to an item on the alumni student survey. The survey will be sent out by the assessment coordinator in March of each year. The survey will be sent to students who graduated in the previous calendar year. A rolling three year average will be reported.

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window 2016-2017 Results, Reflective Statements & Planned Changes)

⦿ Yes

○ No

Specify prior year's results:
Communication - M.A.

☐ 1.1   ☑ 2.2   ☐ 3.1   ☐ 3.3   ☐ 4.1   ☐ 5.1

☐ 1.2   ☑ 2.3   ☐ 3.2   ☐ 3.4   ☐ 4.3   ☐ 5.2

☑ 2.1

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:
Same as above, but this outcome also directly measures students' research participation.

Outcome & Measures Review:

⦿ Revision or explanation needed

○ Satisfactory

Outcome & Measures Comment:
Does the theory course have a number? (Currently listed as 6xxx). Please indicate that a change has been made to Measure 3.1 and 3.2. Please include the alumni survey that will be used for Meaure 3.2. AD 11/5

- Zack's notes 11/20/17
- Outcome 3:
  - Outcome statement is good.
- Measure 3.1:

- Measure looks pretty good.
- Measure 3.2:
  - Measure is pretty solid... Please indicate who the survey is sent to, i.e. all alumni, just new graduates, those 3 years out?
- Attachments:
  - The included attachment goes with outcome 2 and doesn't seem relevent here. It should not be attached to this outcome.
  - Since the questions are listed in the measure for 3.1, an attachment is not necessary for that measure.
  - Please attach the survey used for measure 3.2.
- The reviewer is right that you can click "Yes" under each measure when it asks if a change was made... I understand why you didn't, but I would argue that the changes you made are in response to previous year's results. You found that the previous assessment plan wasn't giving you the data you wanted so you made changes to the plan to collect data that will be more useful to you.

- Zack's notes 11/22/17
- Outcome 3 (formerly outcome 4) Looks good. For 3.4 in the future please either attach the survey to this outcome or make a note that the survey is attached in outcome 1 like you did in measure 2.2. Good clarification in 3.1 and 3.1 as requested. Good adding the additional requested attachments.

Attachments: Items used to assess measures 3.1 and 3.2.docx   thesis methods rubric.docx

Top

Outcome: 4
Students will be able to describe the Communication discipline and its central questions.

Measure: 4.1
Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

At least 90% of students in COM6008 Proseminar in Communication will correctly identify at least three professional organizations in the field of communication. Data will be gathered as an item on a quiz or examination.

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window 2016-2017 Results, Reflective Statements & Planned Changes)

◯ Yes

◉ No

If yes, explain how this measure assesses a new change. If no, explain the reason why this measure does not do so:
No, this is a brand new outcome for this year.

Measure: 4.2
Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised document when you submit the results.

At least 90% of students in COM6008 Proseminar in Communication will be able to offer a correct explanation of the origins of the Communication discipline. Data will be gathered as an item on a quiz or examination.

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window 2016-2017 Results, Reflective Statements & Planned Changes)

○ Yes

◉ No

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

Measure: 4.3

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

At least 90% of students in COM6008 Proseminar in Communication will correctly distinguish the Communication discipline from related areas of study such as Sociology, Psychology, and/or English. Data will be gathered on a quiz or exam item.

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window 2016-2017 Results, Reflective Statements & Planned Changes)

○ Yes

◉ No

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

Outcome & Measures Review:

◉ Revision or explanation needed

○ Satisfactory

Outcome & Measures Comment:
Attachments need to be included for the items that are being used to assess measures 4.1, 4.2, and 4.4. These changes to measure students' abilites in research demosntrate the use of previous assessment results. AD 11/5

- Zack's notes 11/20/17
- Outcome 4:
    - Outcome statement is good.
- Measure 4.1:
    - The measure looks good. I'm slightly uncertain what constitutes "accurately describing". I'm hoping that will be made clear in the results, but you may want to elaborate a little in the measure too.
    - Pretty good explanation for the change.
- Measure 4.2:
    - The measure looks pretty good. I'm slightly uncertain what the students will be asked to do to differentiate. I'm hoping that will be made clear in the results, but you may want to

                                elaborate a little in the measure too.
                            ◦ Pretty good explanation for the change.
                    • Measure 4.3:
                            ◦ The measure looks pretty good.
                    • Measure 4.4:
                            ◦ The measure looks pretty good. As with the other alumni survey measures, who is given
                              the survye? when is it given to them? (X years after graduation? all alumni? etc.)
                    • Attachments:
                            ◦ A copy of the exam, or examples questions for the exam in measure 4.1 should be
                              attached. or an explanation should be provided as to why it cannot be attached.
                            ◦ A copy of the exam, or examples questions for the exam in measure 4.2 should be
                              attached. or an explanation should be provided as to why it cannot be attached.
                            ◦ A copy of the alumni survey should be attached.

            • Zack's notes 11/22/17
            • Outcome 4 (formerly outcome 5) looks good. attachment added as suggested.

Attachments: Measures 4.docx

                                                                                                  Top

Outcome: 5
Students will engage in an immersive, high-impact experience as part of their program of study.

Measure: 5.1
Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not
providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the
measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a
similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised
document when you submit the results.

At least 60% of graduates from the NSC MA Graduate Program in Communication will say they have
participated in producing research that is presented at a conference or published in a journal in
response to an item on the alumni student survey. The survey will be sent out by the assessment
coordinator in March of each year. The survey will be sent to students who graduated in the previous
calendar year. A rolling three year average will be reported.

**Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality,
or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior
year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open
in a new window 2016-2017 Results, Reflective Statements & Planned Changes)**

◯ Yes
◉ No

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

Measure: 5.2
Must be an appropriate, quantitative measure that contains performance targets. If you are not
providing an attachment, please include the URL or a description of the proprietary instrument in the
measure. If using a question in an exam or test that is proprietary, please include an example of a
similar question. It is fine to attach a draft of your assessment tool and you can attach a revised
document when you submit the results.

At least 80% of students will enroll in an Independent Study, Directed Research, or Thesis hours as
part of their program of study. Data will be gathered from graduation review of transcripts when

students apply for graduatation.

Does this measure assess change(s) designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance in response to the previous year's assessment results? (To see prior year's 'Results and Reflective Statement', please click on the following link which will open in a new window 2016-2017 Results, Reflective Statements & Planned Changes)

○ Yes

◉ No

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

Outcome & Measures Review:

◉ Revision or explanation needed

○ Satisfactory

Outcome & Measures Comment:

Please include the quiz that will be used on these three measures if possible. These measures (an outcome) are new so please indicate that this is a change and ideally explain the rationale for instituting this new outcome. AD 11/5

- Zack's notes 11/20/17
- Outcome 5:
    - The outcome statement looks pretty good.
- Measure 5.1:
    - The measure looks pretty good.
    - You can check "yes" when it asks about a change. As described previously, I would argue that you did use previous assessment to make this change.
- Measure 5.2:
    - The measure looks pretty good.
    - You can check "yes" when it asks about a change.
- Measure 5.3:
    - The measure looks pretty good.
    - You can check "yes" when it asks about a change.
- Attachments:
    - The quizzes, exams, or example questions from them, should be attached for each of the measures. or an explanation for why the instrument cannot be attached should be provided.

- Zack's notes 11/22/17
- Outcome 5 was added as a new outcome when revisions were made. (outcome 1 removed, all previous outcomes moved up 1 place, outcome 5 newly added)
- The new outcome and measures look pretty good.
- Something to keep in mind: I'm always a little sceptical of measures that assess whether or not students do something, vs. how well the do something. Such measures are fine, but I find that typically the targets are pretty easily met and they often do not yield data that is very useful for the program. Just a heads-up to mindful of the results and whether the data collected for these measures is beneficial to the program. If yes, then great. If not, then you may want to revise accordingly.
- As I also mentioned in outcome 3, in future plans please either attach the survey here or state in the measure that the survey is attached in outcome 1, like you did for measure 2.2

Attachments:

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 plan 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 plan

◯ Feedback did not result in improvements to this plan

◯ Feedback will help to improve a future plan

◯ The plan 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 Plan. (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 plan 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 plan used the feedback.

◯ Feedback helped to improve this plan

◯ Feedback did not result in improvements to this plan

◯ Feedback will help to improve a future plan

◉ The plan was submitted to the DRC for initial review

◯ Other (Please specify)

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

◯ Beginning (1)   ◯ Emerging (2)   ◯ Maturing (3)   ◯ Accomplished (4)   ◉ Exemplary (5)

Indicators:

☑ 1. Mission statement describes the primary purpose, functions, and stakeholders of the program/unit.
The mission statement should be specific to the program or unit.

☑ 2. Assessment process describes the program or unit's assessment strategy; how that strategy is

translated into outcomes and measures; and the process for reviewing, analyzing, and applying assessment data for program/unit improvement.

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

☑ 3. Number of outcomes:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Additional Indicators:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Overall Comments on Outcomes and Measures:

The Communication MA program does an excellent job with assessment and clearly shows how they use assessment results to make changes to the curriculum. Some minor changes are requested to

clarify points and in including the proper attachments. Overall this plan is excellent and I look forward to the results. AD 11/5

- Zack's notes 11/20/17
- Overall the plan is solid. There are some revisions needed to raise the rating, and some other tweaks that can be made to strengthen the plan overall. Please see the comments below, throughout the plan in the system for details.
- Currently the plan is rated 2-Emerging. A few revisions should allow us to raise the rating all the way to 5-Exemplary.
    - Revisions needed to raise rating
        - Outcome 1 must include a direct measure. Currently all the measures in this outcome are indirect measures. I notice the survey includes a question asking students if they were accepted to a doctoral program. Maybe you could include a measure tracking how many students who apply to doctoral programs are accepted.
        - For all measures that used the alumni survey, please specify who recieves the survey. Is it all alumni? those x number of years out of the program? those just graduated?
        - The following attachments are needed
            - Outcome 1: The survey seems outdated (2014) and doesn't seem to match with the questions/rating system used in the measure. For example measure 1.1 seems to correspond with question 5 on the survey. The measure says the will respond "satisfied or highly satisfied" but the survey asks them to indicate if they were "very well prepared, adequately prepared, or poorly prepared." I think either an updated survey should be attached or the measures should be changed to match what the survey asks.
            - Outcome 2: Attach the survey used for measure 2.2
            - Outcome 3:
                - The attachment included goes with outcome 2 and doesn't belong here. Please remove it.
                - Attach the survey used for measure 3.2
            - Outcome 4:
                - A copy of the exam, or examples questions for the exam in measure 4.1 should be attached. or an explanation should be provided as to why it cannot be attached.
                - A copy of the exam, or examples questions for the exam in measure 4.2 should be attached. or an explanation should be provided as to why it cannot be attached.
                - A copy of the alumni survey should be attached.
            - Outcome 5:
                - The quizzes, exams, or example questions from them, should be attached for each of the measures. or an explanation for why the instrument cannot be attached should be provided.
- If you include a direct measure with outcome 1, specify the survey respondents in the various measures, and include all (or most) of the requested attachements or explanations for why surveys cannot be attached, then we can give credit for rubric item #4 related to number and appropriateness of measures and rubric item #6 related to attachments. The system will then allow us to check #7, #8, #9 which you have already met, but cannot be checked unless all of #1-6 are met first. This will allow us to raise the rating to 5-Exemplary.

- Zack's notes 11/22/17
- It appears that nearly all requested revisions were made. I was able to give credit for the two previously missed rubric items, plus those that the system wouldn't let us check off before. The rating has been raised to 5-Exemplary. Well done!
- Just a few things to keep in mind for next year's plan:
    - Measure 1.1:
        - I'm still a little unclear about the scoring for measure 1.1. The measure says students will be above satisfactory or satisfactory, but the rubric uses a "high", "average", or "low" competency scale. I'm assuming High = above satisfactory and average =

satisfactory? In future plans please clarify or revise the language so that the measure and rubric match.
- Outcome 3:
  - For 3.4 in the future please either attach the survey to this outcome or make a note that the survey is attached in outcome 1 like you did in measure 2.2.
- Outcome 5:
  - As I also mentioned in outcome 3, in future plans please either attach the survey here or state in the measure that the survey is attached in outcome 1, like you did for measure 2.2
  - Something to keep in mind: I'm always a little sceptical of measures that assess whether or not students do something, vs. how well they do something. Such measures are fine, but I find that typically the targets are pretty easily met and they often do not yield data that is very useful for the program. Just a heads-up to be mindful of the results and whether the data collected for these measures is truly beneficial to the program. If yes, then great. If not, then you may want to revise accordingly.

Site maintained by Operational Excellence and Assessment Support
Terms of Use | Privacy Policy | Webmaster