

UCF Assessment

Assessment Plan and Results

Plan Year: Status: Results Approved for DRC Report
 Program/Unit: Last Updated: 10/29/2014 9:42:33 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.

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

View/Submit Results Review  2012-2013 Results Review

Program/Unit: Communication - M.A. DRC:	College of Sciences
Year: 2013-2014	DRC Chair: Cynthia Y Young
Due Date: 08/31/2014	Coordinator(s): Harry Weger, Boyd Lindsley, Kim Tuorto
	Reviewer(s): Alisha Janowsky

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.

Relationship to Strategic Plan:

Outcomes 1, 2, and 3, are all related to the strategic initiative 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 initiative above and the initiative dealing with scholarly research.

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.

- Target met
- Target not met

N=26 students taking elective portion of exams.

5 students passed 2/3 exams
19 students passed 3/3 exams
2 students failed 2/3 or 3/3 exams.

92% passed at least 2/3 exams.

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

- Yes
- No

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

Last year was 88.6%; This year was 92%.

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.

- Target met
- Target not met

n = 12 theses completed in 2013

1 = below satisfactory
 7 = satisfactory
 4 = above satisfactory

11/12 = satisfactory or above satisfactory = 91.6%

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

- Yes
- No

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

Random fluctuation. 100% last year, 100% - one person this year. I don't think this reflects on the program.

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).

Across all students, 92% were rated as satisfactory or above satisfactory. This is a consistent outcome for our program with only minor from year to year (last year was 92.3%). Our reach goal for next year will be 95%. We think this reflects our program's success in delivering knowledge of the literature in the field of Communication to our students.

Reflective Statement Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
- Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

AJ 10/13: Looks good. It might be useful, in next year's plan, to elaborate on the structure of your comprehensive exams (you mention elective items).

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.

- Target met
- Target not met

n = 15

Above satisfactory = 3

Satisfactory = 5

Above Satisfactory or satisfactor = 8/15 or 53%.

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

- Yes
- No

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

Last year's results was 9/15 compared to this year's 8/15. We are still waiting for our program changes to come into effect. We expect that students taking comprehensive exams next year will show improvement.

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.

- Target met
 Target not met

n = 5 students with quantitative methodology in thesis

Below satisfactory = 1

Satisfactory = 1

Above Satisfactory = 3

4/5 = 80%.

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

- Yes
 No

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

As with comprehensive exams, one less student scored satisfactory or above satisfactory than last year (4/4 last year). It is hard to make program generalizations about such a small change so we hope this is a blip. In general, our students have trouble with quantitative research methods and data analysis. We hope recent program changes make an impact.

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).

For whatever reason, our students have a history of poor performance on the comprehensive examinations, but tend to do well when they are under direct supervision on a thesis project. We are still waiting for our new program requirements to make an impact. We plan to look at GRE Quantitative Reasoning scores associations with performance on comp exam results to determine whether we need to increase admission requirements on that portion of the exam. We hope to have those results when we create next year's assessment plan later this semester.

Reflective Statement Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
- Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

AJ 10/13: Nicely done. To "close the loop" it is helpful to go into more detail on what changes you are referring to in this year's assessment plan.

Attachments: Rationale for Sampling Proposal and Explanation of Randomization Procedure.docx
Thesis Assessment Review Sheet.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.

- Target met
- Target not met

n = 15

Above satisfactory = 6

Satisfactory = 6

Unsatisfactory = 3

Above satisfactory + satisfactory = 12/15 or 80%

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

- Yes
- No

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

Last year's result was 77% so this year's result shows a small improvement. We have made small changes in the curriculum by having all faculty teaching the course meet and create more uniform outcomes and content delivery for the course. At that meeting, faculty also reviewed the comp exam questions and noticed one faculty member's exam questions were much more challenging. That

faculty member slightly reduced the number of things students had to discuss which might also have made the exam a bit easier to pass.

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.

- Target met
- Target not met

n = 7 Qualitative Methodology Thesis projects

below satisfactory=0
satisfactory=3
above satisfactory=4

7/7 = above satisfactory or satisfactory = 100%.

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

- Yes
- No

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

Our results were 100% last year as well.

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).

Across thesis and comp exam results, 19/23 or about 83% of students received satisfactory or above ratings on their understanding of qualitative methods. This is a bit below last year's 86% but better than two years ago 81%. We think the 90% goal is a bit of a stretch but we hope that some program changes, e.g., requiring students to earn at least a B in qualitative research methods, will help improve these results. We should start to see students who came in under this program change taking exams and defending theses in 2015.

Reflective Statement Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
- Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

AJ 10/13: well done

Attachments: Thesis Assessment Review Sheet.docx

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.

- Target met
- Target not met

N=9

Participants answering "well prepared" = 4

Participants answering "adequately prepared" = 5

1 participant went to an Ed.D. program and 1 to a PhD program in Counseling instead of Communication so the theory question was answered "n/a" and isn't counted for these participants since communication theory is irrelevant for them.

9/9 = 100%

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

- Yes
 No

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

Same result as last year 4/4 last year, 9/9 this year.

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.

- Target met
 Target not met

N = 11

Participants reporting "well prepared" = 4
 Participants reporting "adequately prepared" = 6
 Participants reported "poorly prepared" = 1

10/11 = 91%

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

- Yes
 No

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

This is a difference of one participant since last year the results reflected 4/4 respondents reported being well or adequately prepared. This is concerning and we will watch this trend over time, but right now we cannot make any generalizations about the program.

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.

- Target met
- Target not met

The 11 students' comments could be broken down into three themes:

Four respondents indicated the rigor in the methods courses was not strong enough.

Three respondents wanted more requirements for producing research as opposed to the exercises in the methods courses.

Two respondents complained that their peers were lazy, didn't work hard enough, and that they seemed to be able to pass anyway.

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

- Yes
- No

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

This is qualitative data so there is no way to measure improvement.

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.

- Target met
- Target not met

For this item, we used data from all respondents who applied, were accepted, and enrolled in classes

(n = 11), respondents who applied, were accepted, but did not enroll (n=3) and respondents who applied but were not accepted (n = 3) for a total n = 17.

12/17 did publish or present research
5/17 did not publish or present research

70.1 respondents applying for doctoral programs published or presented at least one paper with a faculty member or on their own.

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

- Yes
 No

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

Last year we only had 4 respondents and all 4 had published or presented a paper. This has been a strength in the past so this is a noticeable drop off.

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.

- Target met
 Target not met

This is a replication of measure 4.3.

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

- Yes
 No

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

this is a replicatio of another question -- I will remove it in the next plan.

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).

Overall our students report being well prepared for work in doctoral programs. This has been a consistent finding across assessment periods. We have tried to address some of the issues in the past with creation of the Proseminar in Communication course. The first students who were required to take this course will not graduate until spring of '15 so we will wait to see the impact of that course. Unfortunately the comments regarding weakness in methods courses didn't identify a specific course and given the failure rate on comprehensive exams, we do not believe the courses are too "soft". We will continue to monitor comments over time.

Reflective Statement Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
- Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

AJ 10/13: Consider revising your measures to match your survey Likert scales (you have above satisfactory in the measure but reference preparedness in the results). Also, for measure 4.3 you may be able to look at the general trends in responses. Do they seem the same as last year (similar themes)? Did this help inform program change?

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.

- Target met
- Target not met

n = 40 respondents

For the item, "Completion of the MA in Communication has had (will have) a positive impact on my

professional advancement" :

36= "strongly agree" or "agree"

3 = "neutral"

1 = "strongly disagree"

36/40 = 90%

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

- Yes
 No

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

This result is exactly the same as last year, 90%.

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.

- Target met
 Target not met

N = 40

For the item, "The knowledge and skills I learned in the Communication MA program can be applied to one or more professional settings":

38 = "strongly agree" or "agree"

2 = "neutral"

38/40 = 95%

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

- Yes
 No

If yes, describe the improvement by giving a comparison with previous year's results. If

no, please explain:

Although lower than last year (97%) we are still well above our target goal.

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.

- Target met
- Target not met

By far, the most often mentioned weakness by alumni involves courses related to professional practice, especially social media. We are addressing this presently. First, we have hired a new faculty member with expertise in managerial communication and social media for corporate communication. I can now regularly schedule the managerial course which we had to abandon because the only faculty member qualified to teach it retired a few years ago. In addition, this new faculty member is developing a course that specifically addresses the use of social media in corporate communication applications. Finally, we have developed another course in the public relations area that related to public relations in politics and government that focuses on communicating organizational needs and goals to people in governmental agencies.

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

- Yes
- No

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

not quantitative data

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 consistently rate our program as being an important element in their professional success. They also continue to report that the skills and knowledge they acquire in the program are applicable to problems they must solve on the job. Although our students' biggest complaint seems to be too few hard skills courses, they still overwhelmingly report being satisfied with their preparation for life in the workplace.

Reflective Statement Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
- Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

AJ 10/13: Good job. Again, I think you can connect your results from last year in measure 5.3 at least in terms of general trends.

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.

- Target met
- Target not met

N= 15

Above satisfactory = 3
Satisfactory = 10
Below satisfactory = 2

86.6%

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

- Yes
 No

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

Same as last year. 90% is a stretch goal and we keep coming close. We hope the new proseminar course, which includes an introduction to writing academic papers, helps improve this score. We won't see papers from these students until 2015.

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.

- Target met
 Target not met

n = 12

Above satisfactory = 7
Satisfactory = 5

100% scored satisfactory or above satisfactory.

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

- Yes
 No

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

Last year was 10/11 or 90%, so we improved by one students. We expect this since students have an adviser and two committee members to help students develop their arguments.

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).

Across written assignments and theses, 92% (25/27) of our students receive satisfactory or above on a measure of their critical thinking skills as demonstrated in written assignments. This meets the overall target but there is a gap between thesis students and comprehensive exam students. This difference might be due to the amount of oversight thesis students receive on their projects compared to the comp students' term papers. We hope that the additional writing instruction the students receive in the new proseminar course will help improve scores for everyone.

Reflective Statement Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
- Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

AJ 10/13: Good

Attachments: Writing assessment form.docx

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.

- Target met
- Target not met

N=15

Above satisfactory = 6

Satisfactory = 7

Below Satisfactory = 2

87% scored satisfactory or above.

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

- Yes
- No

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

Last year 73% scored satisfactory or above -- a 14% improvement. Again, this is a stretch goal and although we haven't met the 90% goal, we are happy with the improvement.

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.

- Target met
- Target not met

N = 21

Group mean = 5.91 SD = .68

16/21 (75%) Scored at least 5.5 out of 7 points on a 7 point scale.

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

- Yes
- No

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

Although the mean score dropped from last year ($m=6.33$) the decline was less than a standard deviation. We are more concerned that only 75% of our students scored 5.5 or above. Next year we intend to do a more granular analysis looking at specific skills in hopes of ferreting out exactly where our students might need improvement.

Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
- Satisfactory

Reflective Statement:

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

We are somewhat unhappy with the results on these measures for this year. Our students write papers in all of our courses and we hope they would show improvement over time. For the writing skills assessment, we may decide to look at improvement over time in future analyses now that we have a course all students take in their first semester. We can compare starting scores with end of program scores to better determine the value added by completing our program. We think this year's interpersonal scores was an aberration as students have performed well in this area in the past. We will continue to monitor more granular and aggregate scores in the future.

Reflective Statement Review:

- Revision or explanation needed
- Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

AJ 10/13: Good

Attachments: CCQ.docx

Mentoring - Coordinator

1. In what ways did you interact and receive feedback from your assigned IE Assessment Divisional Review Committee (DRC) reviewer(s) and DRC Chair? (Check all that apply)

- Email
- Phone
- Meetings
- From the DRC Review in the IE Assessment Web Application
- I received communication, but was not able to connect with my mentor(s)
- None prior to the first submission of the results report to the DRC for review
- Other (Please specify)

2. Choose the statement below that best describes how you used the feedback from your assigned IE Assessment Divisional Review Committee reviewer(s) or DRC Chair.

- Feedback helped to improve this results report
- Feedback did not result in improvements to this results report
- Feedback will help to improve a future plan
- The results report is being submitted to the DRC for initial review
- Other (Please specify)

Mentoring - DRC Chair and Reviewer(s)

1. In what ways did you interact and provide feedback to the coordinator(s), faculty or staff member(s) involved with this IE Assessment results report. (Check all that apply)

- Email
- Phone
- Meetings
- From the DRC Review in the IE Assessment Web Application
- I attempted contact, but was not able to connect with the assessment coordinator(s)
- None prior to the initial submission of the results report to the DRC for review
- Other (Please specify)

2. Choose the statement below that best describes how the coordinator(s), faculty or staff members involved with this IE Assessment results report used the feedback.

- Feedback helped to improve this results report
- Feedback did not result in improvements to this results report
- Feedback will help to improve a future plan
- The results report was submitted to the DRC for initial review
- Other (Please specify)

Curriculum/Course-related Assessment Methods:

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

Review:

Revision or explanation needed

Satisfactory

Review Comments:

AJ 10/13:
Good

Explain EACH item checked above:

See the rubrics attached in the mentoring and attachments section, no changes from last report.

Examinations/Tests:

Standardized:

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

Explain EACH item checked above:

N/A

Local:

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

Explain EACH item checked above:

We use comprehensive examinations assessing knowledge of literature in the field, qualitative methods, and quantitative methods.

Surveys:**Institution (UCF):**

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

Explain EACH item checked above:

n/a

Local:

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

Explain EACH item checked above:

We survey alumni and report the rolling three year 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:

We ask comp students to submit a written assignment for assessment of critical thinking and writing skills.

Changes to Academic Process:

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

If 'No Changes' indicated, please provide an explanation, including a strategy to improve IE assessment data collection to yield useful information.

We are still waiting for previous changes to start showing positive or negative results, so we are not making changes this year. See below for proposed changes to data collection.

Changes to Curriculum:

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

If 'No Changes' indicated, please provide an explanation, including a strategy to improve IE assessment data collection to yield useful information.

No changes are being considered at this time other than minor tweaks to the quantitative curriculum. See below for changes to data collection.

Changes to Assessment Plan:

- Revise Student Outcome Statement

Criteria:

Please comment on implemented and planned changes

Clear statement of change(s)

Description of how changes created improvements; make suggestions for future cycles

Review:

Revision or explanation needed

Satisfactory

Review Comments:

AJ 10/13: It is appropriate to wait until you can assess your previous changes.
Good report.

This selection can only be a planned change

- Planned Change

Planned change for next assessment cycle:

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

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

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

Our graduate faculty is meeting in early October to review results and to engage in a curriculum mapping exercise. The plan for next year's assessment will reflect any changes made to learning outcomes or measures.

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

Since we have not met yet, I cannot describe changes.

- Revise Measurement Approach
 Collect and Analyze Additional Data and Information
 Change Method of Data Collection

Is this an implemented or planned change?

- Implemented Change
 Planned Change
 Both

Planned change for next assessment cycle:

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

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

Outcome: 2 Measure: 1**Explain the strategy that you will implement to attempt to bring about the change:**

For whatever reason, our students have a history of poor performance on the comprehensive examinations, but tend to do well when they are under direct supervision on a thesis project. We are still waiting for our new program requirements to make an impact. We plan to look at GRE Quantitative Reasoning scores associations with performance on comp exam results to determine whether we need to increase admission requirements on that portion of the exam. We hope to have those results when we create next year's assessment plan later this semester.

This is a change only to the method of data collection. This change is more related to the assessment coordinator's ability to collect data than anything else, although I do expect the quality of the data to improve. Right now we select 15 random comp exams for Outcomes 2 and 3 (measure 1 on both outcomes) and have three

faculty independently score the answers using a rubric. I rarely receive data from all three faculty who are randomly chosen from among our graduate faculty. This method was initiated by the former graduate director. To me, this seems to duplicate efforts. Exams are already being read and graded for graduation purposes. I plan to change this process by simply having the person grading comprehensive exams complete the rubric for each student. This will result in three changes: 1st, we will use ALL of the comp exam results as data, rather than selecting 15 out of about 25. Second, it will likely improve the data because the people grading the comp exams are paying close attention given the stakes for the students involved. Finally, there will no longer be a duplication of effort with multiple people reading comp exams.

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

We will collect data on as many comps as are completed in the assessment period. The comp exam responses will be rated as below satisfactory, satisfactory, and above satisfactory as they have been for several years. The difference is that the person reading and rating the comp exams will be the same person who grades the comp exam for a final grade.

- Other implemented or planned change(s)
 Plan has been reviewed and no changes made
 No Changes to Assessment Plan

Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Results Rubric

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

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

Indicators:

1. Complete and relevant data are provided for all measures and an explanation is provided for how representative samples are determined, if applicable. If data are incomplete or missing, provide an explanation of the extenuating circumstances.

Justification for incomplete or missing data due to extenuating circumstances will not be permitted for two or more consecutive reports. Representative samples should include data from students at a distance (regional campuses or online/video) if courses are offered at these locations/through these modalities.

2. Data reporting is accurate and thorough (see supporting narrative)

Accurate and thorough data reporting means:

- Reported data match data requirements established by a measure.
- Sampling methodology and response rates are provided for survey data.
- The underlying "n" and "N" are provided for all percentage statistics.

3. Results for each measure indicate whether the target for that measure has been met

This may be done explicitly (e.g., "target met" or "target not met") or implicitly (i.e., the reported data clearly indicate whether the target was or was not met).

4. Reflective statements are provided either for each outcome or aggregated for multiple outcomes
Whether individual or aggregated reflective statements are provided, all outcomes must be addressed.

5. Report includes one or more implemented and/or planned changes linked to assessment data and designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit operations. If no such changes are indicated, an explanation is provided including a strategy to improve IE assessment data collection. Implemented and planned changes designed to improve student learning, program quality, or unit performance may be referenced in reflective statements, but should be thoroughly documented in the implemented and planned changes section of this report. NOTE: the IE Assessment Plan should be revised to include one or more measures to assess the impact/effectiveness of such changes. If no such changes are reported, the IE Assessment Plan itself should be carefully reviewed and revised as needed. Implemented or planned changes that are based on factors other than IE assessment data may be reported in the summary statement of the results report. New measures may also be

established in the plan to evaluate the impact of those changes as well, regardless of the reason for the change.

6. Assessment instruments associated with the report and not previously submitted with the plan are provided via attachment or URL if not proprietary.

Copies of assessment instruments should normally have been submitted with the plan during the prior IE Assessment cycle. If that previously submitted plan identified an instrument in development or if another new assessment instrument was developed and used in association with the current results report, that instrument should be attached to this report.

Additional Indicators:

7. Data collection and analysis are used to assess the impact of implemented changes, demonstrating a fully "closed loop" process.

When an outcome and/or measure(s) evaluates the impact of a previously reported change, the reflective statement for that outcome should include a determination of whether the change resulted in an improvement.

8. Follow-up data collected to assess the impact of implemented changes show improved outcomes. Meeting this final criterion for one or more measures is the ultimate goal of IE Assessment. When data confirm improvement(s) in student learning outcomes, program quality, or unit operations, the improvement(s) should be well documented in the applicable reflective statement(s). In addition, the Summary of Assessment Process should provide a brief narrative that describes the entire "closed loop" process that resulted in the improvement(s).

Summary of Quality Improvements:

Think about the last few years and describe evidence-based changes that have taken place because of assessment. Also address other factors that have caused changes to be made (e.g., state mandate, accreditation review recommendations).

Our program has benefitted from assessment in several ways over the last few years. Comments in the surveys we send out led to a few revisions in our curriculum along with some new advising procedures. 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. Fall 2013 was the first edition of this course so we hope to see fewer comments in the future that suggest we are not doing enough to help students prepare for doctoral programs, engage in research with faculty, or mentor students regarding professional opportunities available to graduates of the program.

Another common complaint appearing on the alumni survey was that students felt unprepared to read and understand the methodology sections of the studies they were reading for courses. Fall 2013 was the first year that both the quantitative and qualitative Mass and Interpersonal Communication methods courses had a common number. In addition, these courses are better coordinated across the Mass and Interpersonal Communication faculty who teach them. This has allowed us to advise students to take at least one of these courses within their first nine hours and the other soon after, no matter the semester students begin. We plan to make this a requirement this year. I doubt this particular change will make much difference in method course comp results, but it will help students better understand the material they read in their courses.

For several years we have found students struggle with the methods comprehensive exams indicating they are not learning methodology as well as we hope. We instituted two changes, one is requiring students to pass their methods courses with a grade of B or better and the other is a requirement to pass their both of their methods comp exams. We hope to begin seeing results of these changes in spring '15 comp results. We also hope this will be reflected in alumni survey responses of graduates who have gone on to doctoral programs. Currently, students mostly say they feel adequately prepared for

Review Criteria:

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

- Revision or explanation needed
- Satisfactory

Review:

AJ 10/13: Well written report. The only area I could credit you for was showing the improved outcome as a result of a previous change. As you indicated in your report it seems you will need time for your curriculum changes to take effect.

methods at the doctoral level but we hope that more graduates will say they feel well prepared in future editions of the survey.

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 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](#)