

UCF Assessment

Assessment Plan and Results

Plan Year: Status: Results Approved for DRC Report
 Program/Unit: Last Updated: 10/6/2013 10:33:12 AM

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.

UCF IE Assessment Rubrics - 2009-2010 Plans & Results to 2012-2013 Plans & Results
 Revised UCF IE Assessment Rubrics - 2013-2014 Plans onward
 Assessment Coordinator Instructions

View/Submit Results Review  2011-2012 Results Review

Program/Unit: Communication - M.A. DRC:	College of Sciences
Year: 2012-2013	DRC Chair: Cynthia Y Young
Due Date:	Coordinator(s): Harry Weger, Boyd Lindsley, Kim Tuorto
	Reviewer(s): Seth Elsheimer

Quick Links:

Mission:

The Communication M.A. Program is dedicated to serving its 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:

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.

Top

Outcome: 1

At least 90% of students will demonstrate satisfactory or above satisfactory knowledge of the literature in their field.

Measure: 1.1

Above Satisfactory = Students taking comprehensive examinations will pass all of the elective portion of the exam (3/3 questions). Satisfactory = Students taking comprehensive examinations will pass at least 2 out of three questions on the elective portion of the exam. Below satisfactory = students fail 2/3 questions on the elective portion of the exam.

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.

N=26

20=Above satisfactory

3 = Satisfactory

3 = Unsatisfactory

88.5%; Goal not met for this measure.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 1.2

A panel of three faculty will judge the literature reviews in the past year's theses as above satisfactory, satisfactory or unsatisfactory in terms of (1) breadth, and (2) depth of knowledge demonstrated. Rubric: 3 = Above Satisfactory: both breadth and depth of literature review is at peer reviewed journal quality; 2 = Satisfactory: breadth or depth, but not both, at peer reviewed journal quality; 1 = Below Satisfactory: neither breadth nor depth at peer reviewed journal quality.

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.

N=10

3 = above satisfactory

7 = satisfactory

0 = below satisfactory

100% = satisfactory or above; Goal met for this measure

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Reflective Statement:

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

Our students continue to do well on this measure. Our broad-based program seems to be succeeding in developing a strong understanding of the literature in the field of communication.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Good. Reasonable and appropriate. Understandable to an outside reviewer. All goals were either met or quite close.

Attachments:

[Top](#)

Outcome: 2

At least 90% of students will demonstrate satisfactory or above satisfactory knowledge of quantitative research methods.

Measure: 2.1

A panel of three faculty will judge a random sample of 15 of the past year's comprehensive exams in quantitative research methods as 3 = above satisfactory, 2 = satisfactory or 1 = unsatisfactory in terms of (1) understanding of validity issues in research design, and (2) ability to plan appropriate data analyses. [Please see attachment describing the rationale for sampling and an explanation of the randomization procedure.](#)

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.

2 = above satisfactory
 7 = satisfactory
 6 = below satisfactory

60% = satisfactory above; Goal not met for this measure.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 2.2

A panel of three faculty will judge the methodology and results chapters in the past year's theses that use a quantitative research methodology as 3 = above satisfactory, 2 = satisfactory or 1 = unsatisfactory in terms of (1) understanding of validity issues in research design, and (2) ability to plan appropriate data analyses.

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.

n = 4

2 = Above Satisfactory

2 = Satisfactory

0 = Below Satisfactory

100 = Satisfactory or above; Goal met for this measure

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Reflective Statement:

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

Our students continue to struggle with quantitative research methods on comprehensive exams. Although improved over some past assessment periods, they still fall well below our expectations. We found, almost by accident, that part of the problem both with the quantitative and the qualitative methods exams involves a clever test-taking strategy on the part of some students. Because the methods exams are both the most challenging and time consuming exams, and because they had been scheduled during the same examination period that allocated 3 hours to three exam questions, some students simply punted (i.e., left the response blank) on one or the other methodology exam. 3 of the 6 below satisfactory exams were left blank in this assessment period. Because we allow students to pass comprehensive examination requirement with one failed exam, students chose one methodology exam to fail and spent the extra time on the remaining two questions during the exam period. This gave them extra time for a more challenging exam question. We have taken several steps to derail this strategy. One is, starting with the summer semester, we have moved the exam questions to different exam periods (comprehensive exams are administered in two periods, one on Friday evening, the next on Saturday afternoon). Only two students took examinations this summer and neither punted a methodology question. The second strategy cannot be assessed for about two years. The incoming students this fall must now pass all core exams to fulfill the comprehensive exam

requirement, this will remove the option of purposely failing one methodology exam to spend the extra time to ensure a passing grade on the other.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Good. Reflective statement describes steps taken to move toward improvement in process. Data gathered is clearly being used to make appropriate adjustments.

Attachments: Rationale for Sampling Proposal and Explanation of Randomization Procedure.docx

Top

Outcome: 3

At least 90% of students will demonstrate satisfactory or above satisfactory knowledge of qualitative research methods. (N= 15).

Measure: 3.1

A panel of three faculty will judge a random sample of 15 of the past year's comprehensive exams in qualitative research methods as 3 = above satisfactory, 2 = satisfactory or 1 = unsatisfactory in terms of (1) understanding of validity issues in research design, and (2) ability to plan appropriate data analyses. **Please see attachment describing the rationale for sampling and an explanation of the randomization procedure.**

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.

2 = above satisfactory

9 = satisfactory

4 = below satisfactory

73% = satisfactory or above; Goal not met for this measure.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 3.2

A panel of three faculty will judge the methodology and results chapters in the past year's theses that use a qualitative research methodology as 3 = above satisfactory, 2 = satisfactory or 1 = unsatisfactory in terms of (1) understanding of validity issues in research design, and (2) ability to plan appropriate data analyses.

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.

n = 7

3 = above satisfactory

4 = satisfactory

0 = below satisfactory

100% = satisfactory or above; Goal met for this measure.

Note: One thesis used mix methods so N for qualitative plus N for quantitative assessment = 11 out of N=10 theses total.

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).

Students met this goal for supervised research projects (theses) but just missed the goal for comprehensive exams. 2 out of the 4 below satisfactory exams were left blank. It appears some students use the strategy described in the reflective statement for quantitative research methods exams. We hope the countermeasures employed for those exams will also reverse this trend in the qualitative exams as well.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Good. Reflective statement describes steps taken to move toward process improvement. Data gathered is clearly being used to make appropriate adjustments.

Attachments:

Top

Outcome: 4

At least 90% of graduates who apply to doctoral programs will be satisfactorily or above satisfactorily prepared to succeed at the doctoral level.

Measure: 4.1

Our graduates who entered doctoral programs will be asked (email survey) how well their masters

program prepared them for doctoral work (above satisfactory, satisfactory, below satisfactory) in the area of theory. Data will be collected for the past three years.

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.

4/4 respondents strongly agreed that the NSC MA program prepared them for doctoral work in the area of theory. Goal met.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 4.2

Our graduates who entered doctoral programs will be asked (email survey) how well their masters program prepared them for doctoral work (above satisfactory, satisfactory, below satisfactory) in the area of methodology. Data will be collected for the past three years.

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.

3/4 respondents agreed
1/4 respondents disagreed
Goal Not Met.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 4.3

Our graduates who entered doctoral programs will be asked (email survey) to identify specific areas in which the NSC M.A. program was weak in preparing them for doctoral level work.

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.

The only respondent for this question identified the qualitative research methods course was too narrowly focused on ethnography to the exclusion of other qualitative research methods.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 4.4

At least 80% of our graduates who apply to doctoral programs will have published one or more peer-reviewed articles and/or presented one or more conference papers as a student in our Program.

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.

3/4 published a paper or presented a paper at a conference. Goal Not Met.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 4.5

To assess program weaknesses in preparing students for graduate work, graduates who go on to Ph.D. programs will be asked (email survey) to identify weaknesses in our program in preparing them for doctoral level work in our discipline.

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.

This is the same as measure 4.3.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Reflective Statement:

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

It is tough to generalize from such a small sample, but the results indicate we have met our goal on most of the above measures. This is right in line with most assessment periods in which our students routinely report our program prepares them for doctoral work in some of the highest rated programs in the country. Again, the small sample meant that having 3/4 students publish or present resulted in missing our goal, we will monitor this outcome carefully over time but we do not feel any need to make adjustments at this time.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☒ Revision or explanation needed
- ☐ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

This may be fine as is but it would be helpful to know how many students actually entered Ph.D. programs. Are the 4 respondents cited here the total number solicited or were there many non-respondents? If, for example, there were 20 requests and only 4 responded that would be indicative of a process problem that might require adjustment. Also non-responders and responders are self-selected groups that may skew the results in one direction or another.

Attachments:

Top

Outcome: 5

At least 80% of graduates will report favorably on the impact of the Program's relevance to professional career advancement. (N=approx. 25).

Measure: 5.1

Students will be contacted by email within one year of graduation and asked to assess the impact of the degree on their career advancement. An email reminder will be sent to those who do not respond within one week. Data will be presented for the previous year.

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.

N=27

Item = Completion of the Communication M.A. program has had (will have) a favorable impact on my professional advancement.

12 strongly agreed

12 agreed

3 neutral

88% agree with item: Goal Met.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 5.2

Students will be contacted (email survey) within one year of graduation and asked to assess the relevance of program content to applied professional settings. Data will be presented for the previous year.

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.

N = 27

Item: The information and skills I learned in the Communication M.A. program can be applied to one or more professional settings.

16 Strongly agree

10 Agree

1 Neutral

96% Agree with item: Goal Met.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 5.3

Students will be contacted by email within one year of graduation and asked to identify specific areas of weakness in the M.A. program as it relates to their perceived preparation for their professional development.

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.

Several respondents identified areas for improvement in the NSC MA program. The general comments are summarized below:

- Program needs more structure for beginning students
- Too many/not enough PhD development courses
- Not enough real world applications
- Courses were not challenging enough – some students did little work but still passed
- Could not get elective courses in Mass Communication
- Too much focus on theory
- No one told me how to get a job with this degree

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).

Over time our students have consistently rated our program as important to their career development and relevant to solving problems in their field. We have addressed the issue of job development by creating a career planning module in our new required proseminar for newly admitted students. We are also undertaking changes to our program to create more scaffolding for students as they work their way through our program.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Good. Goals were met and in some cases data collected are being used to make adjustments.

Attachments:

[Top](#)

Outcome: 6

At least 90% of graduates will demonstrate satisfactory critical/analytical thinking skills (N= 15). Rubric for outcome 6, measures (1) and (2): Above Satisfactory: Writing consistently demonstrates competency in at least three of the following characteristics: presents a clearly defined central position; provides the necessary amount of evidence to support claims; chooses the appropriate evidence to support claims; offers logical explanation of evidence: Satisfactory: writing generally demonstrates competency in at least three of the following: presents a clearly defined central position; provides the necessary amount of evidence to support claims; chooses the appropriate evidence to support claims; offers logical explanation of evidence: Below Satisfactory: Writing consistently fails to demonstrate competencies above and/or consistently demonstrates two or more of the following problems: lacks or does not clearly define a central position; fails to provide enough evidence to support claims; chooses inappropriate or irrelevant evidence to support claims; offers illogical or no explanation of evidence.

Please see attachment describing the rationale for sampling and an explanation of the randomization procedure.

Measure: 6.1

Students taking comprehensive exams will be required to submit a writing sample consisting of any paper written for a course in the Communication M.A. program. A panel of three faculty will assess the student's writing using the the rubric above. 15 of the papers will be chosen at random for assessment purposes.

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.

On a scale of 3 = above satisfactory, 2 = satisfactory and 1 = below satisfactory:

The average score across judges and papers was 2.33.

13 out of 15 papers averaged a score of 2 or higher across judges; 86.67% of students were judged satisfactory or higher.

Goal Not Met.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 6.2

A panel of three faculty will judge students' critical thinking skills based on the literature review and discussion sections of the past year's theses. The rating scale will be above satisfactory, satisfactory, below satisfactory using the rubric above.

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.

N = 11

Above Satisfactory = 3

Satisfactory = 7

Below Satisfactory = 1

90% rated satisfactor or above: Goal Met.

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).

As in the past, our thesis students have demonstrated strong critical thinking skills. We have just begun the new process of using student papers for assessing critical thinking. Although our students average met the satisfactory mark, we just met the stated goal of 90% meeting or exceeding a satisfactory mark. This year we changed to a sampling system to reduce workload and improve compliance by faculty members in returning assessments. This has worked well with 90% of the

faculty returning assessment data. On the other hand, limiting the number to 15 means that only one student can be scored lower than satisfactory for us to meet our goal. We plan to readjust the goal to 80% for this measure, which is more realistic and attainable given the small number of data points.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

This all appears reasonable and appropriate. Result under Measure 6.2 has an omission: "satisfactor" was likely intended as "satisfactory"

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

Graduates will demonstrate satisfactory communication skills on the following measures:

Measure: 7.1

Students taking comprehensive exams will be required to submit a writing sample consisting of any paper written for a course in the Communication M.A. program. A panel of three faculty will assess the student's writing using the the rubric below. 15 student papers will be selected randomly for review. At least 90% of students will score Above satisfactory or Satisfactory.

Rubric for measure 7.1: Above Satisfactory: Writing shows high competence in the areas of precision, organization (including effective use of transitions), use of grammar, and language usage.

Satisfactory: Writing is below the high competence level in one or more areas listed in the AS category, but is at least adequate in all areas. Unsatisfactory: Writing is below adequate and needs improvement in one or more areas listed in the AS category

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.

On a scale of 3 = above satisfactory, 2 = satisfactory and 1 = below satisfactory:

The average score across judges and papers was 2.02.

11 out of 15 papers averaged a score of 2 or higher across judges; 73.3% of students were judged satisfactory or higher.

Goal Not Met.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 7.2

Students completing internships will be assessed on their workplace interpersonal communication skills by their supervisors. Upon completion of the internship, supervisors will be asked to complete an online questionnaire consisting of the Communicator Competence Questionnaire. As a group,

internship students will reach **at least a score of 5.5** on a 7 point scale on the CCQ (**see attachment for items**) for a satisfactory assessment.

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.

Example Items:

My intern is a good listener:

My intern writes effectively:

My intern's email messages reflect the level of professionalism expected by my organization:

Results (N = 11)

Overall mean = 6.33 out of possible 7

10 of 11 averaged 5.5 or above out of possible 7 on CCQ

Goal Met

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).

Our students continue to be rated highly by their internship supervisors, we are pleased to see this goal being met repeatedly. Although our students met the writing measurement goal last year, they failed to do so this year. Again, this may in part be the lack of wiggle room given the small number of data points or it could reflect a cohort with less developed writing skill than in previous assessment periods. As with the critical thinking measure, we plan to adjust our goal to 80% to create a more realistic goal.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Seems fine.

Attachments: CCQ.docx

Curriculum/Course-related Assessment Methods:

- ☒ Capstone Course
- ☒ Capstone Project or Performance Evaluation

Criteria:

Please
comment on
implemented

- ☐ Case study / Simulation
- ☒ Course-embedded Questions
- ☒ Portfolio
- ☒ Rating Scale / Scoring Rubric (yields a grade)
- ☒ Assessment Rubrics (student demonstrates proficiency)
- ☐ Lab Journals / Reports
- ☒ Observation (focused on specific program outcomes)
- ☐ Other method

Explain EACH item checked above:

See previous plans/results. No changes.

Examinations/Tests:**Standardized:**

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

Explain EACH item checked above:

We do not have nationally normed or other standardized exams in our field.

Local:

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

Explain EACH item checked above:

We use comprehensive exam responses for assessing quantitative and qualitative methodology knowledge. No changes.

Surveys:**Institution (UCF):**

- ☐ UCF Graduating Student Survey (Seniors or Graduate student)
- ☐ Alumni Survey
- ☐ Student Satisfaction Survey
- ☐ First Destination Survey
- ☐ Employee Survey

Explain EACH item checked above:

None.

Local:

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:

This all agrees with earlier parts of the report and seems both reasonable and appropriate.

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

Explain EACH item checked above:

No changes, see previous plans/results.

Other Survey(s):

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

Explain EACH item checked above:

N/a

Miscellaneous Assessment Methods:

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

Explain EACH item checked above:

N/a

Changes to Academic Process:

- ☐ Modify Frequency or Schedule of Course Offerings
- ☐ Make Technology Related Improvements
- ☐ Make Personnel Related Changes
- ☐ Implement Additional Training
- ☐ Revise Advising Standards or Process
- ☐ Revise Admission Criteria
- ☒ Other implemented or planned change
- ☒ No Changes to Academic Process

Explain EACH item checked above:

We plan to move to a calendar year assessment period, so our next report will include only one additional semester of data. We do not feel that new changes are warranted until we review our next assessment effort. In addition, we have implemented changes that will not produce impacts until the 2012-13 cohort near graduation. We have made a change to our comprehensive exam procedure. We now require students to pass all core course exams (Both tracks include theory, qualitative methods, quantitative methods, and for the Interpersonal track, Interpersonal Communication). We plan to also change our degree requirements so that students must pass all core courses with a grade of "B" or better.

Changes to Curriculum:

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

Explain EACH item checked above:

To address alumni concerns about having a strong foundation for later work, we are planning to require both research methods in students' first year in the program in addition to the newly implemented requirement of completion of the proseminar in each students' first semester.

Changes to Assessment Plan:

- ☐ Revise Student Outcome Statement
- ☒ Revise Measurement Approach
- ☐ Collect and Analyze Additional Data and Information
- ☐ Change Method of Data Collection
- ☒ Other Planned Changes
- ☐ Plan has been reviewed and no change made
- ☐ No Changes to Assessment Plan

Explain EACH item checked above:

Because we two semesters of data We are moving to a calendar year assessment so two semesters of data from this assessment period will be included in the next period. Because of this, we do not want to change much about our plan. However, as discussed in reflective statements, our goal of having 90% of our students meet or exceed meet or exceed satisfactory evaluations on exams, papers, and the like is unrealistic when looking at 15 randomly chosen examples of work. We therefore plan to adjust the standard down to 80% compliance.

Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Results Rubric

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

☐ Beginning
 ☐ Emerging (2)
 ☐ Meets Expectations (3)
 ☐ Accomplished (4)
☒ Exemplary (5)

Indicators:

- ☒ 1. Complete and relevant data are provided for all measures OR if data are incomplete or missing, an explanation is provided
- ☒ 2. Data reporting is thorough (see below)
i.e., populations are defined; sampling methods and response rates are provided with survey data, etc.
- ☒ 3. Results for each measure indicate whether the target for that measure has been met
- ☒ 4. Reflective statements are provided either for each outcome or aggregated for multiple outcomes
- ☒ 5. Implemented and planned changes are included and are linked to assessment data, or if no changes are reported, an explanation is provided

- ☒ 6. Assessment instruments are attached or linked to if not proprietary

Additional Indicators:

- ☒ 7. Includes description of how the assessment process has been useful to your program or unit
- ☒ 8. Includes description of how IE Assessment has resulted in quality improvement initiatives
- ☒ 9. Data collection and analysis are used to assess the impact of implemented changes, demonstrating a fully "closed loop" process

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).

Our program has benefitted from assessment in several ways over the last few years. Comments from students have helped us revise some curriculum and advising issues. For example, we created a Proseminar in Communication course as a way to orient our students to the Communication MA program culture, to the professional organizations in our field, and to career opportunities available to graduates. We have also begun making some changes to our curriculum by merging the Interpersonal and Mass Communication methods courses into more general courses that can serve students from both areas. This eases advising issues. We had trouble with part time students taking research methods courses in their first 9 hours because the Mass Com course is only offered in the fall and the Interpersonal Com course only offered in the spring. We would either make them wait a year to take the course or allow them to take the course in the other area. In the assessment alumni survey we received feedback suggesting this was slowing student progress down or forcing them to take courses without the methodology background that would help them understand the research they were reading.

Our assessment process has also helped alert us to an issue we did not know we had. Through this process we have found that a small group of students seem to have found a way to "game" the comprehensive exam process. Students only have to pass five of six exams in total, and because the methods exams are among the toughest, they had been leaving one blank in the hopes they could spend the extra time on the other methods exam in the hopes this would help them pass at least one of them. This led us to look deeper. We found that a small portion of our students who have poor math ability also decide that they will use their one "C" grade for the quantitative methods course and then answer only the qualitative comprehensive exam question. This has led to two changes, one already implemented the other coming this year. First, we will require "B" grades for all of the program core courses, this will require students to work harder in the quantitative methods course, hopefully helping them learn more. Second, we now require all new students to pass all core course comprehensive exams, again, this makes it impossible for them to simply opt out of taking them. We hope our assessment data shows this was a wise decision.

Although we missed our goal for writing and critical thinking this year using student papers as data for assessment, we are fairly happy with the results. One point of conversation in our first meeting this year involves our faculty expressing their feeling that they seem to see more examples of poor writing than in the assessment data. One reason for this is that the rigors of our program probably weeds out the truly terrible writers so that they never make it to the point where they will be taking comprehensive exams, so we only see the students who have succeeded in our program in our assessment data. This provides us with some indirect evidence that our program does provide a rigorous academic experience to our students.

Data from assessment also helps us identify what we are doing well. Our best students who go on to doctoral programs report that our program serves them well in preparation for doctoral work. Across the board, our students who complete a thesis meet or exceed our program outcome goals. Our professionally oriented students also

Review Criteria:

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

☐ Revision or explanation needed

☒ Satisfactory

Review:

Well done. The program has gathered data and evaluated it critically with an eye toward any changes that might be needed. Some appropriate adjustments are underway.

report that their experience in our program is both relevant to their career and plays a role in helping them develop their career.

Site maintained by Operational Excellence and Assessment Support
[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Webmaster](#)