UCF Assessment

Assessment Plan and Results

Plan Year: [2014-2015 ▼]   Status: Results Approved for DRC Report
Program/Unit: [Communication - M.A.   ▼] Last Updated: 11/3/2015 4:19:15 PM

We strongly recommend not copying directly from Microsoft Word or Excel to the rich text boxes as the text being copied may contain html and/or xml code which may hinder how the document is viewed. We suggest to first paste the text to notepad, then copy the text from notepad to the rich text box.

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

View/Submit Results Review 🔴   2013-2014 Results Review

Program/Unit: Communication - M.A.	DRC:	College of Sciences	
Year:	2014-2015	DRC Chair:	Elizabeth Grauerholz
Due Date:	09/23/2015	Coordinator(s):	Harry Weger, Boyd Lindsley, Kim Tuorto
		Reviewer(s):	David Gay

Quick Links:

Mission:

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

Assessment Process:

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 iniative aimed at improving graduate level education by assessing student knowledge of literature in the field and methods of inquiry.

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

Top

Outcome: 1

Students will demonstrate broad knowledge of the literature in the field of communication.

Measure: 1.1

90% of students taking comprehensive examinations will pass 2 out of 3 elective area comprehensive examinations.

The following rubric will be used to asses elective portion comprehensive exam questions:
Pass:
To pass, a student's answer must conform to 5 of 6 of the following requirements:
Responds adequately to the questions asked,
Responses to question are accurate with analyses that go beyond the obvious.
Provides sufficient and appropriate evidence and, makes effort to contextualize it.
Responses contain distinct units of thought in paragraphs, coherently arranged.
No more than occasional weakness in transitions between sentences, paragraphs or thoughts.
No more than a few minor grammar errors (e.g., agreement, tense) or cases of imprecise language or awkward syntax.

Fail:
An answer will be graded as "fail" if:
Answer reflects student does not understand questions and/or concepts.
No discernable responses to most elements of the question are given.
Little or no evidence cited to support responses.
Responses are arbitrary or not structured, illogical or not coherent.

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

94% (17/18) passed at least 2 out of 3 exams. The overall breakdown follows: 2 students passed 2/3 exams and 15 students passed all three exams, 1 student failed 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 it was 92% but the 2% increase is statistically insignificant. We looked more closely at our

data to find out if there were patterns in the exams students failed and there was none. The four failed exams, one each by two students and two by a third student, were all from different courses. Traditionally is a pretty typical result. I think we obtained this result because our do receive a broad education and finish the program with a strong knowledge of the literature in the field. Also, about three years ago, most faculty began providing students with study guides. We will meet this semester to determine if we can find a more rigorous measurement procedure for looking at this outcome, but we do think comp exams seems the best place to do this. We also discovered that some of the rubric we used includes some writing elements that are not well measured on comp exams as the goal is more about the knowledge they demonstrate than their expression of it. We will adjust the rubric. We think in the next plan we will require students to exhibit all of the measurement traits rather than 5/6 of them for assessment purposes. We will also keep a record of exactly which elements students meet so we can conduct a more fine grained analysis of student performance.

Review:

◯ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Measure: 1.2

90 % of thesis students' literature review chapter will be rated satisfactory or above satisfactory by their thesis commitee. 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

100% (n=6) rated satisfactory or above on this measure. More specifically, 2/6 received an above satisfactory and 4/6 recevied a 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 one person came in below satisfactory so technically results improved but not in any substantial way. Our students do well on this important measure. We will continue to monitor our students performance on this. We plan to talk about ways of finding more specific information about student performance on this outcome.

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).

I think we obtained these results because our students receive good training in their elective courses and retain their understanding of the literature in our field and demonstrate this on their exams and in their theses. There isn't much room for improvement. We could raise the bar to 100% but we don't see a way to change the curriculum or program to reach that level. For outcome 1.1, we will stretch to targeting 90% of our students will pass all three exams as a new target.

Reflective Statement Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Measure 1.1: Additional data would be helpful. With an n of 6, you may want to provide more detail. In later results you distinguish between those who were above satisfactory and those who were at satisfactory. Frankly, I am not sure if that is important to your assessment. DG

- Zack's notes 9/30/15
  - Measure 1.1 Results:
    - I agree with the reviewer I would like to see more data. Specificlaly granular/disaggregate data.
      - You provide us with the rubric info in the measure. How about providing us with the numbers for each rubric requirement? How many students met each item for each exam.
      - Any differences from exam to exam? Was one of the exams seemingly more difficult for students than the others?
    - Expound upon these things. Provide analysis.
    - I know with the small samples and high results there is not much room to improve, but is there anything the program has done or can do to create improvement? It seems that there is more room to work within the second target of students passing all three exams. And you mention in the reflective statement that you will set a stretch target changing the goal to 90% will pass all three exams (nice change). But what are you going to do to try to improve from 83% to 90%?
  - Measure 1.2 Results:
    - Same as with 1.1 we want to see the granular/disaggregate data.
      - How many scored a 3 (above satisfactory) and how many scored a 2 (satisfactory).
    - What might the program do to have more students scoring above satisfactory.
    - For future plans you may want to consider a more detailed and varied rubric. A 3-point scale doesn't leave much room for analysis.
  - Reflective statement and Overall outcome 1 comments:
    - For future plans, if you are consistently reaching your targets and scoring 90-100% on these measures it may be time to change the measures to something more challenging. A major part of Assessment is finding areas that can be improved and making changes to create that improvement. If you're hitting homeruns every year in a certain area why worry about it. Focus on other areas that may provide more opportunity to improve the program, and more useful data for the program.
  - The detail provided for Measure 1.1 makes the expectations clear. DG 10/22/15

Attachments:

Top

Outcome: 2

Students will demonstrate ability to explain, critique, and apply appropriate research methods in a broad range of situations and contexts.

Measure: 2.1

90% of students taking the comprehensive examination will pass the quantitative research methods portion on their first attempt.

The following rubric will be used to determine a passing grade for the comprehensive examination:
Pass: Student must complete 6 of the 8 tasks below.
Fail: Student completes 5 or fewer of the 8 tasks below.
Based on a sample research article:
1.   the student correctly identifies research design
2.   student identifies independent and dependent variable
3.   student correctly identifies hypothesis to be tested
4.   correctly produces a statement of the null hypothesis
5.   student correctly identifies measurement adequacy of independent and dependent variable
6.   student correctly interprets statistical result
7.   student correctly identifies alternative IV
8.   student correctly constructs a hypothesis based on the alternative IV

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

89% (16/18) passed their quantitative comp exam on the first try.

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 had 53% judged to be satisfactory (e.g., passing) or better so this is a significant improvement. This result, we think, can be directly tied to a number of changes to our program. The first change was creating the more stringent program requirement that all students pass the quantitative course with a B- or better. In the past, students could receive a C in this course. We think students are working harder in the course and their improved understanding of quantitative methods is showing up on the comp exam. The second change we made was making it mandatory for students to pass the comp exam to graduate. In the past, students could fail this exam and still graduate, so many students basically punted on the exam and spent their effort on passing all the other exams. We think the requirement to pass the exam has improved the time and effort they devote to studying for the exam. Although not a program requirement, our assessment results lead to faculty coming together to find a common exam across sections that more directly conform to the course outcomes. So all students take a very similar exam no matter the instructor. Also as a result of assessment, instructors have begun offering study sessions for the comp exams which is well

attended. Standardization of the exams helps students better prepare for them in concert with the study sessions. So we are cautiously optimistic that our students will continue their success and continue to improve.

Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed
◉ Satisfactory

Measure: 2.2

90% of students taking the comprehensive examination will pass the qualitative research methods portion on their first attempt.

The following rubric will be used to determine a passing grade on the comprehensive exam:
Pass: The student demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of all three elements below.
Fail: The student demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of two or fewer of the elements below.
Differentiate between quantitative and qualitative research methods
Identify a research question best studied using qualitative research methods.
Identify and describe the strengths and weaknesses of at least three different qualitative methods.

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

100% (18/18) students passed their qualitative methods comp on the first try.

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 80% were judged to be satisfactory (e.g., passing) or above. One reason we think students performed better this year involves two programatic changes that resulted from previous assessment results. As with quantitative methods, students must now pass the course with a B- or better and must pass the qualitative research methods course in order to graduate. Although the exams remain less consistent across instructors, we think the time and effort students spend in the course and in preparing for exams has paid off significantly in students' performance on the examinations. This semester the qualitative methods instructors will meet to discuss common outcomes across the sections to identify better measurement of our outcomes that will include collecting and reporting more fine grained analyses of our data.

Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed
◉ Satisfactory

Measure: 2.3

100% of students' theses will be judged as satisfactory or above satisfactory on all of the following elements:
Methodology is appropriate to research question(s).
Quantitative/qualitative tools are utilized effectively.
Methodology produces sufficient evidence to address research question.
Student identifies weaknesses/tradeoffs in her/his methodology compared to other possible methodologies.
Rating scale: Above Satisfactory: Satisfactory: Below Satisfactory

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

100% (6/6) were rated satisfactory (2/6) or above satsfactory (4/6) on their methodology sections in their theses.

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 was a tiny bit better than last year's 11 out of 12 or 92%.

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).

The most notable result this year was the large improvement in students' performance on quantitative and qualitative comp exams. The largest improvement came on the 36 point improvement on their quantitative exam performance. This is something we've been working on for a while. First we required students to pass their quant and qual courses with at least a B and this year was the first class who was required to pass both their quant and qual exams to graduate. We think this provided enough motivation to work hard in the course and improved motivation for studying for the comp exams. In addition, we have standardized the exam across sections and instructors. We also now have a core group of three instructors who have worked with the grad director in curriculum mapping to ensure the outcomes across sections and instructors match. We hope by next year we will hit the 90%

mark.

Although not as much of an issue in recent years, we have tried to standardize curriculum across qualitative courses as well, although the exams are still fairly variable across instructors. We think that this work at standardization and also the new requirements for students to pass both the core course and the comprehensive exam has improved learning in the course and has motivated students to work a bit harder in studying for the exam.

Reflective Statement Review:

⚪ Revision or explanation needed

⦿ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Additional data would be helpful. In your reflective statement you may want to include granular data. That is, go one step beyond percentages. The 36 point improvement is quite impressive. Measusre 2.2. also exhibited significant improvement. DG

- Zack's notes 9/30/15
    - Measure 2.1: Similar comments to 1.1.
        - We'd like to see granular/disaggregate data. Break down the numbers for each of the various rubric items.
        - Expound and analyze
        - You do a good job in the reflective statement explaining what changes were made that may have led to the improvement of the results. Were these changes brought about in part due to past assessment results or were they made for unrelated reasons? You might also consider mentioning some of that under the results section where it asks "Did your results show an improvement... If yes, describe the improvement..." Also in comparing last year to this year having last year's sample size might provide some extra perspective.
    - Measure 2.2: similar to the overall comments for outcome 1.
        - For Future plans, Since your target is 100% and you seem to be reaching it or close fairly consistently perhaps it is time to consider new measures.
        - The sample size from last year might also help us better understand the improvement for this measure.
    - Measure 2.3:
        - Better job here of providing granular/disaggregate data by showing how many scored above satisfactory and how many at satisfactory. You could provide a little more by telling us which of the elements the satisfactory students missed.
        - Good job her providing the sample size from last year to give us a little better perspective.
    - Reflective Statement:
        - good job explaining what may have led to improvement for 2.1. As mentioned above some explanation of what prompted the changes would be good.
        - As the reviewer mentioned you saw a 20% improvement in 2.2 as well. What may have caused that? or is the explanation for improvement the same for both measures. Maybe the reflective statement can be reworded to provide some explanation for 2.2 or make it clearer that the explanation already there applies for 2.1 and 2.2.
        I have nothing to add to these notes. DG 10/25/15
- The explanation of the role of assessment in shaping these changes is clearer. LG 11/3/15

Attachments:

Top

Outcome: 3

Graduates will be well prepared for life after graduation. Data will be gathered using an online survey and three year rolling averages will be reported.

Measure: 3.1

90% of graduates who have enrolled in doctoral degree programs will report satisfactory or above satisfactory preperation for doctoral work in general and in the areas of theory and methodology. A three year rolling average will be reported.

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

Overall: 88% (8/9) rated NSC MA satisfactory (n=3) or above satisfactory (n=5)

Theory: 100% (7/7) rated NSC MA satisfactory (n=1) or above satisfactory (n=6). Two students entered doctoral programs in other areas (Mental health counseling and Education) where preparation in Communication theory was irrelevant so I excluded them from the analysis.

Methodology: 100% (9/9) rated NSC MA satisfactory (n=6) or above satisfactory (n=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:

Overall, the results improved but the smaller sample resulted in a smaller percentage base so we slipped from 10/11 to 8/9. So in both years, only one person surveyed was rated their training as less than satisfactory. I was able to go back into the survey and look at answers to measure 3.5 to identify perceived weaknesses in the program for those who gave lower than "above satisfactory" ratings. The student who reported less than satisfactory training overall also gave only a satisfactory rating for methodology and theory. The student felt the qualitative methods course, and instructor, was too narrow and did not provide a broad enough base of qualitative methodology to be useful in the doctoral program. The same for the theory course. In fact, all students rating methodology as only satisfactory complained about the same instructor and course. Although the instructor is no longer a member of our faculty, the qualitative course is much less consistent across sections and probably focuses more on the instructor's particular favored method of doing qualitative research. I have scheduled meetings with the instructors to try to at least agree on a common set of outcomes and a list of methods each instructor will cover.

Review:

◯ Revision or explanation needed
◉ Satisfactory

Measure: 3.2

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

88% or 8 out of 9 either published one or more peer reviewed articles or presented one or more conference papers. Breaking down the data a bit more shows that 2/ 9 published one or more peer reviewed articles and 7/9 presented one or more conference papers (1 both published and presented) as a student in our program. These numbers are revised from the first submitted report in which I inadvertantly reversed the breakdown of published and presented papers.

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 were 70% compared to 88 % this year. I think one reason for the increase is the addition of a faculty culture of including graduate students in research. We are working on increasing the number who publish with us but since it is a two year program, it is hard to get manuscripts turned around in that time. This number counts two papers that were submitted before the students graduated but does not count manuscripts submitted after students graduated. If we included this number, 7 out of 9 of the students went on to eventually publish an article with a faculty member here in the NSC. Although not tied to assessment, our program does a great job mentoring students headed toward a PhD so we actively encourage them to become involved in faculty research programs so they have research experience on their CV when they apply to doctoral programs. All 9 students report in the survey that they were admitted to one of their top five choices for doctoral programs, so it appears to be a successful mentoring effort.

Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Measure: 3.3

90% of students will agree or strongly agree with the following statement: The skills and knowledge I aquired during the Communication MA program can be applied to my current job responsibilities.

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

92% (n=38) Reported that they Strongly agree (n=17) or agree (n=18) with the statement "The skills and knowledge I aquired during the Communication MA program can be applied to my current job responsibilities." 3 people reported that they disagreed with the statement.

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 ins slightly better than last year's 90%. I discuss this more below in the reflective statement.

Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed

⦿ Satisfactory

Measure: 3.4
90% of students will agree or strongly agree with the following statement: Completion of the Communication M.A. program has had (will have) a favorable impact on my professional advancement.

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

94% (36/38) agreed (n=22) or strongly agreed (n=14) with the statement, "Completion of the Communication M.A. program has had (will have) a favorable impact on my professional advancement." Only 2/38 disagreed with this statement.

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 tiny bit better than last year's 90%. I discuss this in more detail below in the reflective statement.

Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Measure: 3.5

Our graduates will be asked (online survey) to identify specific areas in which the NSC M.A. program that can be improved to help prepare students for life after graduation.

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

In Summary of the responses, four general themes emerged (n=23 responses):

Too many/not enough PhD development courses
Not enough real world applications/skills
Grading was too easy in some classes – some students did little work but still passed
Statistics course was not helpful

A few of the students who want to move on to a doctoral program wanted more courses that specifically involved writing papers or other activities to prepare them for doctoral work or to help them build skills they'll need in their doctoral programs. Many more students who want to develop skills for their professional life wanted hands-on and applied skills training rather than theory based research type courses that make up the bullk of our offerings. As we develop our doctoral proposal this year, we also plan to make changes to our MA program to offer a track that includes more of these types of courses. We now have several faculty memebers who are grad faculty scholars with long histories of professional experience that we hope to leverage in this plan by having them teach courses with more of an applied focus.

The top students always seem to think that some students are getting away with studying less than them. Of course, some students do study less, but our comp results seem to suggest they are learning in these courses, just maybe not as much as our top students.

We have found that the statistics course that we instituted a few years ago, and taught by the statistics faculty, is not very popular and often replicates a lot of what we do in our own methods courses. We plan to make some curriculum changes this year to address this.

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:
N/A this is narrative rather than quantitative so this question is not answerable.

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 have historically performed well on these measures. We consider our program a feeder for high level doctoral programs and the rigor in our courses shows by the alumni feeling well prepared for the rigors of their doctoral programs. Our students typically are offered admission to one of their top five choices.

To better understand why 3 students for measure 3.3 and 2 students for measure 3.4 did not agree with these statements, I looked at their answers to measure 3.5 to identify their perceptions of weaknesses in our program. In general, these students responses to 3.5 indicated that there was not enough courses or mentorship to help them develop their professional skills to help them find employment at the level they desire. Based on another, non-assessment related survey, and the results of some non-reported items on the assessment survey, we are in the early planning stages of developing either a certificate or a new track that will provide more hands-on professional development type courses for the students who make up the majority of our program -- working professionals. As a program, we have been working to hire more instructors with terminal degrees to help develop these courses and hope to have them coming online in the near future. However, we do not think a large shake-up of our current program is necessary as the large majority of professional students view our program as beneficial and providing important skills and knowledge. We have already added several courses in public relations and strategic communication that, while academically rigorous, have obvious applications in the work of PR and other communication professionals. As a result of assessment a few years ago, we have also added a certificate program, open to our MA students, that offers a focus in the more professionally oriented courses. Although it hasn't changed assessment results to any significant degree, the number of students who identify the lack of professionally oriented courses has diminished in response to measure 3.5.

We recognize that 3.5 is not quantifiable, this measure was added a couple years ago at the request of an assessment reviewer who suggested it would help us ferret out the few negative responses we receive to the closed ended items regarding professional development. Our next assessment plan will eliminate the reporting of this measure and use it instead to suppliment our analysis.

Reflective Statement Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Measure 3.2: Eighteen percent is quite an improvement. You may want to provide additional information. Assessment survey is included and should be helpful over time. How will you stay contact with graduates?
Do you have any particular strategies for connecting theory and research courses to applied professions?

- Zack's notes 10/5/15

- Measure 3.1:
    - There isn't much else you can do with this one. You report the different scores. and you were at or near 100%
    - Can you provide any analysis regarding the one person who replied unsatisfactory? can that results tell us anything as to why they may have replied that way.
    - With the two students who pursued PhDs in other fields, I think that excluding them from the numbers is reasonable, but is there any useful information (narrative or other wise) that results from those students can provide?
- Measure 3.2:
    - Nice job reporting the dissagregate data of publications vs. presentations. Is there any other analysis you can provide?
    - Only 2 of 9 students published. Does the program want to improve this number? what might the program do to create improvement in number of students publishing.
    - The reviewer makes a good point about 18% improvement being pretty significant. What may have contributed to this improvement? Changes the program made, sample size variation?
- Measure 3.3:
    - Similar to 3.1 is there any analysis that can be provided regarding those who disagreed with the statement?
    - Even though the improvement was only 2%, what might account for that improvement? program changes? sample size variation?
- Measure 3.4:
    - Same comments as for 3.3
- Measure 3.5:
    - Assessment requires that measures have quantitative measurable targets. This measure does not fit that criteria.
        - For next years plan I recommend removing this measure and using the data reported here to provide more detailed analysis for measures 3.1-3.4.. For all those measures we've requested more information/analysis and the narrative in this measure provides that pretty well.
            - For example you talk here about students moving on to PhD programs wanting more course work that will help them in those programs. This is the kind of thing I would like to see discussed in the results for measure 3.1.... Also the information here talks about more hands-on opportunities for those taking other routes. This would be good analysis for 3.3... the rest you could pepper in throughout the other measures and in the reflective statement.
- Reflective Statement:
    - You mention that you've added courses. Were past assessment results responsible in any way for the adding of these new courses? Have these new courses attributed in any way to the improvements we've seen in these measures

    I have nothing to add to these notes. DG 10/25/15

Nice addition of information about the role of assessment, and more detailed analysis of results. LG 11/3/15

Attachments: Graduate_Assessment_Survey.pdf

Top

Outcome: 4

Graduates will demonstrate competent written and oral communication skills.

Measure: 4.1

At least 90% of students will score above satisfactory or satisfactory on the writing skill rubric below. Student papers from the Mass Communication Theory and the Modern Communication Theory courses will be evaluated by the course instructor and one other judge.

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

No data this year. By the time our assessment plan was approved, it was the middle of the fall semester. Since we are on a calendar year assessment cycle, it was too late for the spring '14 course and, because of a last minute loss of a faculty member, we had to move the theory course scheduled for fall '14 to the spring of '15.

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:
See above.

Review:
○ Revision or explanation needed
◉ Satisfactory

Measure: 4.2
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. At least 90% of students will score at least a score of 5 on a 7 point scale on the following CCQ (see attachment) items:
My intern is a good listener.
My intern can deal with others effectively.
My intern works well in groups.

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

Results: n = 14
My intern is a good listener = 100% (14/14) scoring 5 or above
My intern handles conflicts with other employees effectively = 100% (8/8 with 6 answering no opportunity to observe) scoring 5 or above
My intern works well in groups = 100% (14/14) scoring 5 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's numbers (75% scored at least 5.5 averaging the scores across the three measures) were likely an aberration. Our more granular approach this year looks more like our outcomes in years past.

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).

Unfortunately we ran into problems with gathering data with measure 4.1 this year, so we need to wait for the next assessment cycle. However, we expect results to be fairly consistent with past years, the only real difference is that we are using papers from core courses rather than papers submitted by students at comp exam time. This will help standardize the assessment process providing a better base of comparison across students.

As far as the oral communication skills, we are not surprised. Many of these students learned these skills as communication undergraduates and developed them more by adding an understanding of the theoretical bases for these skills as a graduate student.

Reflective Statement Review:

◯ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:
The report includes the problems experienced in gathering data for 4.1. My guess is that it is also difficult to get information from all supervisors of interns (i.e., some supervisors had no opportunity to observe). Perhaps supervisors could be made aware of the expectations at the start of the internship. Future data collection should help you "close the loop." DG

- Zack's notes 10/5/15
- Measure 4.1: It is understandable that data was not collected this year. The explanation is satisfactory.

- Measure 4.2: Similar to other measures if you're at 100% consistently you might consider measuring something else or changing the criteria to collect data that might be more useful and give the program opportunities to create improvement.
- Reflective Statement: Good changes to the assessment process with the change of evaluating papers from core courses to create better consistency.

Attachments: CCQ.docx

Top

Outcome: 5

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

Measure: 5.1

90% of students taking comprehensive exams will pass the theory portion of the exam on their first attempt.

The following rubric is used to determine pass/fail of comprehensive exam:
Pass: Student satisfactorily completes all three of the following tasks:
Fail: Student completes two or fewer of the following tasks:
Student correctly identifies and describes epistemology, axiology, and ontology as they relate to communication theories;
Student can satisfactorily compare and contrast any two of the seven communication theory traditions from the following list: semiotic, phenomenological, cybernetic, socio-psychological, sociocultural, critical, and rhetorical;
Student correctly identifies standards for evaluating social scientific theories.

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

100% (18/18) students passed the theory comprehensive exam on their first attempt.

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:

We added this outcome and measure for the first time this year. We think requiring students to pass the theory course with at least a B- and also requiring students to pass their theory comprehensive exam is responsible for the high pass rate. Given the high initial pass rate, we plan to look at our criteria for next year more carefully in the assessment plan.

Review:

◯ Revision or explanation needed

⦿ Satisfactory

Measure: 5.2
90% of students will be rated satisfactory or above satisfactory in on each of the following scales:

Theory Critique: 3 = Above Satisfactory: Student synthesizes multiple theoretical perspectives in a logical way; provides well-reasoned critique of theory; uses logical rationale in developing ideas and/or supporting claims made about theory in the paper.   2 = Satisfactory: Student satisfies all but one of the characteristics in the "above satisfactory" category   1 = Below satisfactory: Student fails to satisfy two or more characteristics in the "above satisfactory" category

Theory explanation: 3 = Above Satisfactory: demonstrates precise and detailed understanding of theoretical bases of one or more communication theories   2 = Satisfactory: demonstrates basic understanding of one or more communication theories, but lacks precision and/or detail   1 = Below Satisfactory: fails to demonstrate basic understanding of one or more communication theories

Theory application: 3 = Above satisfactory: applies theory in a novel or creative way; 2 = Satisfactory: correctly applies theory in a conventional way; 1 = below satisfactory: misapplies theory or does not apply theory at all

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

Although it isn't as clear as it should be, this measure was to use students' term papers from their core theory course. As I explained above for measure 4.1, we did not have data to assess this outcome this assessment cycle.

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:
See above

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).

The results of measure 5.1 goes well with the results of 3.1 showing that our alumni feel well prepared for doctoral work in the area of theory. As with the results for the qualitative and quantitative methods, we increased the rigor of our program by requiring at least a B in the theory course and by requiring that students pass the theory portion of the comp exam to graduate. These changes seem to be working as intended and our already strong faculty and curriculum is perceived by our students to be strong.

Reflective Statement Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Additional data for Measure 1.1. In general, the progam met their targets and, on some measures, demonstrated substantial improvement. Collecting and improving follow-up data collection should help in "closing the loop." This data collection should help in assessing strategies to help students draw connections between theory and practical applications. DG

- Zack's notes 10/5/15
- Measure 5.1: As the reviewer mentions we'd like to see some more analysis of the data. For example on the part where they have to compare/contrast 2 of the 7 theories are there any patterns there? are students choosing some more than others? Are some of them easier to respond to than others? If so, does that mean the program should spend more time teaching the other theories so students will have a better understanding of them and feel more comfortable writting about them.
- Measure 5.2: As you mention when you write your 2015-16 plan be sure to add to the measure description that the term papers are what is being evaluated. The explanation about the data from the previous outcome/measure is reasonable for this cycle.
- Reflective statement: Were any of the changes you made in regard to the rigor the result of assesment? Can any of the improvements shown be attributed to these changes?

I have nothing to add to these notes. DG 10/25/15

Attachments:

Mentoring - Coordinator

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

☐ Email

☐ Phone

☐ Meetings

☐ From the DRC Review in the IE Assessment Web Application

☐ I received communication, but was not able to connect with my mentor(s)

☑ None prior to the first submission of the 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

Explain EACH item checked above:

Captsone: We used results of comprehensive examinations and students' thesis projects for some of our measures.

Assessment rubrics: We used rubrics in association with the comp exams and thesis

Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Review Comments:

For the Capstone Project, you note that comprehensive and thesis projects were used for "some" of your measures. You also explained that rubrics were used. Data on writing skill well be helpful when it is available. Are there any other course related assessments?

Alumni surveys should also be helpful in the future to assess proposed changes. A closer examination of structure of the internship survey may be helpful since some of the supervisors did not have the opportunity to observe. DG

- Zack's notes 10/5/15
- The identified instruments/tools and their explanations is satisfactory.

projects to determine the level of proficiency in their performance on those projects. We also planned to use a rubric in assessing writing skill, but as we discuss on the results page, we were unable to gather data for those measures on this assessment cycle.

Examinations/Tests:

Standardized:

☐ Nationally-normed Exam

☐ State-normed Exam

☑ Other

Explain EACH item checked above:

Local:

☑ Post-test Only

☑ Pre-post Test

☑ Other exam or test

Explain EACH item checked above:

Surveys:

Institution (UCF):

☐ UCF Graduating Student Survey (Seniors or Graduate student)

☐ Alumni Survey

☐ Student Satisfaction Survey

☐ First Destination Survey

☐ Employee Survey

☐ Entering Student Survey

Explain EACH item checked above:

Local:

☑ Alumni Survey (Department or Program; not UCF)

☑ Customer Satisfaction Survey

☑ Exit and Other Interviews

Explain EACH item checked above:
We used survey questions to assess alumni

perceptions of the program.

Other Survey(s):

☐ National Survey

☐ State Survey

☑ Other Survey

Explain EACH item checked above:

We also used a survey of internship supervisors to assess graduate student interns' communication skills while on the job site.

Miscellaneous Assessment Methods:

☑ Advisory Board

☐ Focus Group

☐ Institutional Data

☐ Student Records

☐ Accreditation Reviews (e.e. SACS, CAEP, ABET)

☑ Other

Explain EACH item checked above:

Changes to Academic Process:

☑ Modify Frequency or Schedule of Course Offerings

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: 3 **Measure:** 5

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

Criteria:

Please comment on implemented and planned changes

☑ Clear statement of change(s)

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

Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Review Comments:

It seems reasonable to wait and assess recent changes. DG

- Zack's notes 5/10/15
- Great planned changes regarding the course offerings! You used assessment data to identify areas that can be made better, and are planning to change the curriculum because of past assessment results. Great example of putting the first 2 steps of closing the loop into practice. After implementing the changes, when you collect data in the follow up results report to see if improvement occurred you will have also completed step 3... The only difficulty I see is that it will be difficult for you to get step 4 which is seeing

We have historically performed well on these measures. We consider our program a feeder for high level doctoral programs and the rigor in our courses shows by the alumni feeling well prepared for the rigors of their doctoral programs. Our students typically are offered admission to one of their top three choices.

At the same time, we work hard to make clear to our professionally oriented students how theory and research apply to their professions. We have already added several courses in public relations and strategic communication that, while academically rigorous, have obvious applications in the work of PR and other communication professionals.

We plan to add an additional course with more obvious professional applications, such as Conflict, Small Group, Management Communication courses each semester to provide the professionally oriented students more courses that satisfy this desire.

Describe the data that you will collect to assess the change to provide evidence of improvement:
In Summary of the responses, four general themes emerged (n=23 responses):

Too many/not enough PhD development courses
Not enough real world applications/skills
Grading was too easy in some classes – some students did little work but still passed
Statistics course was not helpful

A few of the students who want to move on to a doctoral program wanted more courses that specifically involved writing papers or other activities to prepare them for doctoral work or to help them build skills they'll need in their doctoral programs. Many more students who want to develop skills for their professional life wanted hands-on and applied skills training rather than theory based research type courses that make up the bullk of our offerings. As we develop our doctoral proposal this year, we also plan to make changes to our MA program to offer a track that includes more of these types of courses. We now have several faculty memebers who are grad faculty scholars with long histories of professional experience that we hope to leverage in this plan by having them teach courses with more of an applied focus.

The top students always seem to think that some students are getting away with studying less than them. Of course, some students do

improvement. all your results for the related measures are already at or near 100% so there really isn't much room to create improvement. However, even if you don't see improvment it is okay. The first 3 steps are the most important. Taking the steps to identify areas for change, implementing change, and collecting data to assess the changes.

- You check "no changes to curriculum" then in the explanation you say that you have made changes in recent years. You should check yes to changes in curriculum then select "implemented change" and tell us what changes you made previously, why the changes were made, and what improvements if any have come about as the result of the change. This could provide the evidence needed for "closing the loop" and move the report rating to exemplary.
- Same as above in regard to changes to assessment plan. you say no changes and then say that you overhauled the plan.... check yes changes then "implemented" and tell us about them.

study less, but our comp results seem to suggest they are learning in these courses, just maybe not as much as our top students.

We have found that the statistics course that we instituted a few years ago, and taught by the statistics faculty, is not very popular and often replicates a lot of what we do in our own methods courses. We plan to make some curriculum changes this year to address this.

☐ 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

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.

We have made several changes to curriculum in recent years that seem to be finally paying off so we want to see how the next year or so unfolds before revising curriculum again.

Changes to Assessment Plan:

☐ Revise Student Outcome Statement
☐ Revise Measurement Approach
☐ Collect and Analyze Additional Data and Information
☐ Change Method of Data Collection
☐ Other implemented or planned change(s)
☐ Plan has been reviewed and no changes made
☑ No Changes to Assessment Plan

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

After consultation and curriculum mapping last

year, we overhauled the assessment plan last
year and we want to look at results for at least
three years before changing the plan again.

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).

In recent years we have made several changes in response to three drivers of change: curriculum mapping, program review, and students' poor performance on the methods portion of their comprehensive examinations.

In response to curriculum mapping, student performance on comp exams, and program review, we have been able to create a more standardized and consistent set of core courses (which are Theory, Quantitative Methods, and Qualitative methods). I think this has played at least some role in improving students performance on comp exams with nearly 100% passing all three exams.

In response to program review, we have become more selective in our admissions decisions by increasing our expectations for GRE Quantitative Reasoning scores and overall application quality. Also in response to program review, we have increased the rigor of our program by requiring a grade of B in our core courses (before students could earn C's and still graduate) and by requiring a passing score on all core courses (before students could fail a core exam and still graduate). Increasing the rigor has resulted in a smaller enrollment because we admit fewer students and because students who earn C's in core courses sometimes leave the program before graduation. However, we think overall the increase in rigor positions us more favorably for an addition of a doctoral program and has resulted in improved learning across the curriculum as evidenced by the improvement in assessment measures. We hope to continue to see high numbers and that we hit our target for quantitative methods for the first time since we began assessment. We hope in the long run the increase in quality of our program attracts more highly qualified students so that we can begin to grow our enrollment again. At this point, we want to take a breather and gather at least two more years of data before embarking on additional changes to the core of our program or to our assessment plan.

Results of our alumni survey have also caused us to think more about the split in our students interest with a sizable majority coming to us to increase their professional resumes and to gain additional skills. We are now planning to revive the Business Communication track. This track never actually enrolled any students for a variety of reasons beyond the scope of this report. We plan to create some courses, such as media management and communication campaign management, that would attract more students to our program and that would better serve the students looking to upgrade their professional credentials.

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

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Review:

Two more years of follow-up data should help "close the loop."

- Zack's notes 10/5/15
- Overall this results report covers the basics, but we would like to see more detail.
- A few notes about particular rubric items.
- #2 was checked since the results data is accurate and in some areas is probably thorough enough. The main data was included for each measure but we want to see more analysis. The kind of insight and evaluation that you provide in the results for 3.5 and at the end of this report in the summary section are the kinds of things we'd like to see talked about in the results for the measures.
- #7 was not checked. We see a couple areas where improvement

occurred and you talk about some changes that the program has made in recent years, but you need to connect them... What changes were made, why were they made, what data was collected to see if the changes created improvement, did improvement occur due to the changes?

- #8 can only be checked if 1-7 are all checked. Once all the steps/information for #7 are in place then if improvement occurred we can check off #8.

You've done a nice job with revising this report. It's much clearer now (especially with Outcomes 2 and 3) that changes were made as a result of assessment and in some cases, there has been improvement. You've demonstrated a closed-loop! LG 11/3/15

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