UCF Assessment

Assessment Plan and Results

Plan Year: 2015-2016 ▼   Status: Results Approved for DRC Report
Program/Unit: Communication - M.A.   ▼ Last Updated: 11/28/2016 2:03:51 PM

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

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

View/Submit Results Review 🔴   2014-2015 Results Review

Program/Unit: Communication - M.A.	DRC:	College of Sciences
Year: 2015-2016	DRC Chair:	Elizabeth Grauerholz
Due Date:	Coordinator(s):	Harry Weger, Boyd Lindsley, Kim Tuorto
	Reviewer(s):	Amy Donley

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 receive an evaluation of satisfactory on 2 out of 3 elective area comprehensive examinations.

The following rubric will be used to asses elective portion comprehensive exam questions. To receive a satisfactory evaluation, a student's answer must conform to 3 of 4 of the following requirements:

Response demonstrates specific and detailed knowledge of the literature relevant to the exam question.
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.

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

Spring 2015 N = 8
5 students received satisfactory evaluation on 3/3 exams
2 students received satisfacorty evaluation on 2/3 exams
1 student received satisfactory evaluation on 1/3 exams

Summer 2015 Results N= 5

2 students received satisfactory evaluation on 3/3 exams
3 students received satisfactory evaluation on 2/3 exams

Fall 2015 Results: N = 8

5 received satisfactory evaluation on 3/3 exams
2 received satisfactory evaluation on 2/3 exams
1 received satisfactory evaluation on 1/3 exams

19/21 or 90% of students received satisfactory evaluation on 2/3 exams

Granular data:
n = 63 exams were graded
Response demonstrates specific and detailed knowledge of the literature relevant to the exam question. **57 of 63 questions were rated satisfactory on this element.**
Responses to question are accurate with analyses that go beyond the obvious. **57 of 63 questions were rated satisfactory on this element.** Provides sufficient and appropriate evidence and, makes effort to contextualize it. **58 of 63 questions were rated satisfactory on this element.**
Responses contain distinct units of thought in paragraphs, coherently arranged. **56 of 63 questions were rated satisfactory on this element.**

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

○ Yes

◉ No

If yes, describe the improvement by giving a comparison with previous year's results. If no, please explain:
There was no improvement this year but the difference was essentially one additional student who failed to pass 2/3 exams so we are not ready to make anything of this.

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

Overall n = 6 for 2015
Above Satisfactory = 3 Satisfactory = 3 Below Satisfactory = 0
6/6 (100%) = 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:
It was the same as last year, 100% there really is no room for improvement from last year.

Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Reflective Statement:

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

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 and given that student effort in studying for exams plays a role in whether they pass, it seems unlikely that curriculum changes could result in a 100% pass rate on the exams.

I gathered more granular level data this year to determine if there was any particular part of the rubric that students were having problems with. The results suggest that students are about equally like to miss any particular part of the rubric. The issue is that students who pass the exam tend to be rated satisfactory on all four rubric items but a student who fails tends to miss every element on the rubric. This might be a sort of bias on the part of graders who rate the student as unsatisfactory on each rubric item because a poor answer tends to make the grader see the effort overall as poor. I'm not sure this data is of much help. This is the first year we gathered this data, we will continue the next couple years to see if this trend continues.

Reflective Statement Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Measure 1.1 For clarity, it would help to add to the granular data explanation that each student takes three exams (21 students x 3 = 63 exams). Measure 1.2. You have achieved 100% for at least 2 years. Consider changing this measure to one that would be more useful in assessing the outcome in future years. The inclusion of the granular data is good and I agree that analyzing the data in the future is a good idea. - AD 9/15
I agree with Reviewer's comments. Perhaps for 1.2, rather than raise the bar to 100%, you could strive to have a higher percentage earning "Above Satisfactory"? LG 9/19

Attachments: thesis.docx

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 receive a satisfactory evaluation on the quantitative research methods portion on their first attempt.

The following rubric will be used to determine a satisfactory evaluation for the comprehensive examination:
Satisfactory: Student must complete 4 of the 5 tasks below.
Based on a sample research article:
Identifies independent and dependent variables
Identifies sample type and procedure
Identifies operational definitions
Identifies alternative measurement procedure
Accurately interprets statistical data.

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 in 2015   Spring 2015 N = 8
4 students received Above satisfactory evaluation
3 students received satisfacorty evaluation
1 student received satisfactory evaluation
Granular level results Identifies independent and dependent variables 6/8
Identifies sample type and procedure 8/8
Identifies operational definitions 7/8
Identifies alternative measurement procedure 7/8
Accurately interprets statistical data. 8/8

Summer 2015 Results N= 5

1 students received above satisfactory evaluation
3 students received satisfactory evaluation 1 student received an unsatisfactory evaluation

Granular level results Identifies independent and dependent variables 5/5
Identifies sample type and procedure 3/5
Identifies operational definitions 2/5
Identifies alternative measurement procedure 4/5
Accurately interprets statistical data. 4/5

Fall 2015 Results: N = 8

2 received above satisfactory evaluation
5 received satisfactory evaluation
1 received unsatisfactory evaluation
Identifies independent and dependent variables 8/8
Identifies sample type and procedure 8/8
Identifies operational definitions 6/8
Identifies alternative measurement procedure 6/8
Accurately interprets statistical data. 5/8
OVERALL: 18/21 students received above satisfactory or satisfactory evaluations = 86%.

Granular level results
Identifies independent and dependent variables 19/21
Identifies sample type and procedure 19/21

Identifies operational definitions 15/21
Identifies alternative measurement procedure 17/21
Accurately interprets statistical data. 17/21

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:
The results about the same as last year but is a bit lower, 86 to 89%. We're calling it no change.

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 of the four elements below.
Fail: The student demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of two or fewer of the elements below.

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

Spring '15 n = 8
7/8 passed the qualitative research methods portion of the comprehensive examination.
Differentiate between quantitative and qualitative research methods. Satisfactory = 8/8
Identify a research question best studied using qualitative research methods. Satisfactory = 8/8
Identify and describe the strengths and weaknesses of at least three different qualitative methods. Satisfactory = 7/8.

Summer '15 n = 5   5/5 passed the qualitative research methods portion of the comprehensive examination.
Differentiate between quantitative and qualitative research methods. Satisfactory = 5/5
Identify a research question best studied using qualitative research methods. Satisfactory = 5/5
Identify and describe the strengths and weaknesses of at least three different qualitative methods.

Satisfactory = 5/5

Fall '15 n = 8 6/8 passed the qualitative research methods portion of the comprehensive examination.
Differentiate between quantitative and qualitative research methods. Satisfactory = 7/8
Identify a research question best studied using qualitative research methods. Satisfactory = 8/8
Identify and describe the strengths and weaknesses of at least three different qualitative methods. Satisfactory = 7/8

18/21 - 86% - passed the qualitative research portion of the comprehensive examination.
Overall:
Differentiate between quantitative and qualitative research methods. Satisfactory = 20/21
Identify a research question best studied using qualitative research methods. Satisfactory = 21/21
Identify and describe the strengths and weaknesses of at least three different qualitative methods. Satisfactory = 19/21

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:
Interestingly, the same number passed as last year but we had three people fail this year bringing our result from 100 to 86%. We frankly believe last year was an historical outlier as I explain below in the reflective statement.

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

AY 2015 n = 6
Quantitative/qualitative tools are utilized effectively. 4/6 = above satisfactory 2/6 = satisfactory

Methodology produces sufficient evidence to address research question. 5/6 = above satisfactory 1/6 = satisfactory

Student identifies weaknesses/tradeoffs in her/his methodology compared to other possible methodologies. 3/6 = above satisfactory 3/6 = satisfactory

6/6 (100%) of students were judged to be satisfactory or above satisfactory on each of the three elements 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:
Same as last year, 100%.

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 faculty was a little disappointed in the slight drop in ratings of the quantitative and qualitative comprehensive exam performances this year. We really didn't think we'd maintain a 100% pass rate for the qualitative exams as we think last year was an outlier, but we hoped to reach 90% on both exams this year. Even though we didn't see great improvement, we remain satisfied with the overall trend over the last couple of years. Before last year, it wasn't unusual to have less than 60% pass these exams each year. This is the second year we have seen significant improvement over the past. We can attribute this trend to changes we have made to our program and to the comprehensive exam process.

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.

This year we gathered more granular level data for both comp exams.

For the most part, the mistakes made by test takers appear to be spread fairly evenly over the rubric items. The only apparent trend is that students appear to struggle most on the quantitative exam with identifying operational definitions. This year we plan to stress this in the quantitative course in order to improve the scores next year.

Reflective Statement Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Measure 2.1 Correct typo in spring data to reflect that 1 student earned an unsatisfactory rating. Measure 2.2 Clarify the measure. It states "The student demonstrates satisfactory knowledge of all three of the four elements below." but only three elements are presented in the granular data. Are there only three elements? Measure 2.3 does not seem to be useful for the assessment. The goal has been reached for 2 years in a row and it seems that thesis chairs make sure that the student has met these goals prior to defending a thesis. Overall: Excellent use of data in identifying the students' weakness in identifying operational definitions and the attempt to correct this. it will be interesting to see next year's data on this particular data point. - AD 9/15

I agree with Reviewer--great discussion of results and use of granular data. Glad to see that you have already decided to implement a change to bring up the ratings on identifying operational definitions. LG 9/19

Attachments: thesis.docx   Quantitative rubric.docx   Qualitative rubric.docx

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 preparation for doctoral 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

N=8 (this is the first year we used this survey)

7/8 reported feeling very well prepared (i.e. above satisfactory)
1/8 report feeling adequately prepared (i.e., satisfactory)

Overall, 100% felt adequately or very well prepared overall for work at the doctoral level.

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

⦿ Yes
◯ No

If yes, describe the improvement by giving a comparison with previous year's results. If no, please explain:
In a slightly different version of the survey, we had 88% (one fewer) say they felt at least adequately prepared.

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

N=8

5/8 or 62.5% reported publishing or presenting research as a student in our program.

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 8 out of 9 report presenting or publishing with a faculty member.

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

N=44

23 = strongly agree
19 = agree
1 = neither agree or disagree
1 = disagree
0 = strongly agree

95% either agree or strongly disagree 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 year is slightly higher than last year's 92% and also higher than two years ago 90%.

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

N=45

26 = strongly agree
14 = agree

4 = neither agree or disagree
0 = disagree
1 = strongly disagree

89% either strongly agree or agree

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 fewer disagreed this year than last, we had four people who were essentially neutral, bringing the result to just under 90% from last year's 94%.

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).

Outcome 3 and the measures associated with it, although slightly tweaked for this year's assessment plan, usually meet or exceed targets in all areas. This year we missed the mark in a couple of places.

One place we missed the mark involves publishing/presenting papers with students headed to PhD programs. We think this year is an aberration given the results are out of the norm over time. Even so, we will re-emphasize in our required master's proseminar course, in our orientation, and in our graduate faculty meetings, the importance of student engagement in research with faculty. We are somewhat surprised by this result since our survey shows (although not part of our assessment plan) that a bit more than 50% of all of our students present or publish with faculty. On the other hand, our goal of 80% might be somewhat unrealistic given that students have just two years with us but we want to aim high since it is an important factor in bringing attention to our program at conferences and in the journals. We asked respondents what the strengths and weaknesses of the program were. About half listed research opportunities with faculty as a strength and about half listed lack of required research projects as a weakness. So we are obviously not as consistent in communicating the research opportunities available to students as we had thought. We are also not as consistent as we could be in our courses. Some instructors require full research projects in classes and some do not for our quant and qual methods courses. I plan to meet with faculty in these areas to work out a more consistent policy across sections of the course.

We also missed on a measure we have never missed on: 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." Although we only received one "disagree" response, we received 4 neutral responses. To understand this result better, we asked students about strengths, weaknesses, and courses they would to have wanted us to offer that are not currently offered. Although alumni see our faculty as a strength, they overwhelming are asking for more applied courses for students who are not seeking a career as an instructor or going on for a Ph.D. This has

been a consistent concern of alumni over several iterations of our survey. We have started conversations with the College of Business and the Public Administration department to build a new interdisciplinary track for students who desire more applied courses linked to professional contexts. We hope to have the track up and running within two years.

Reflective Statement Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Across measures, including the response rate would be helpful. Measure 3.1- Excellent measure. Measure 3.2- I would suggest assessing presentations and publications separately. While it is expected that more students will present as opposed to publish, monitoring the progress among students who do publish would potentially be useful for the program. Measure 3.3 and Measure 3.4 - both good measures that have shown some variability over the years and should be monitored going forward. In the reflection statement it is clear there is an effort to use this feedback to better prepare students which is excellent to see. - AD 9/18

This is one of the best Reflective Statements I've read. It's great to see a program and its faculty using assessment in this way to identify and correct limitations. Hopefully next year the implemented changes you note in your Reflective Statement will result in improvements. LG 9/20

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

N= 5 students Modern Communication Theory

Above Satisfactory: Writing shows high competence in the areas of precision, organization (including

effective use of transitions), use of grammar, and language usage. 3/5 students rated satisfactory

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. 2/5 students rated satisfactory

Unsatisfactory: Writing is below adequate and needs improvement in one or more areas listed in the AS category. 0/5 rated unsatisfactory

N =18 students Mass Communication Theory

Above Satisfactory: Writing shows high competence in the areas of precision, organization (including effective use of transitions), use of grammar, and language usage. 7/18 students above satisfactory

   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. 9/18 students satisfactory

   Unsatisfactory: Writing is below adequate and needs improvement in one or more areas listed in the AS category 2/18 students unsatisfactory

  Total

10/23 rated above satisfactory

11/23 rated satisfactory

2/23 rated unsatisfactory

21/23 rated satisfactory or above = 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:
We didn't report data last year, but we met our target.

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

n=13 interships in 2015.

My intern is a good listener. 13/13 were rated 5 or higher.

My intern can deal with others effectively. 13/13 were rated a 5 or higher

My intern works well in groups. 11/11 were rated a 5 or higher (2 responded "no opportunity to
observe on this item).

100% were rated a 5 or higher on these items from the CCQ.

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 also 100% across the items.

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 were pleased with this result. Our students typically do well on the oral communication portion but
have often been just below our targets for the writing portion. In the fall of 2013 we began offering
Proseminar in Communication. Part of this course involves instruction on writing academic papers,
specifically, literature reviews. Since then, we have been continually working on modifying this course.
In summer of 2015 a colleague and I did some restructuring of the exercises and assignments related
to the written project in the course. I think our work to improve student writing has had a positive
impact on this outcome as measured by students' performance on literature reviews. At this time, we
plan to leave these changes in place and monitor students' performance again this year.

We are generally unsatisfied with our measurement for the oral communication outcome because so few of our students complete internships. We plan to change this measure to an indirect observation using an item on our alumni survey each year. We think the internship outcome reflects alumni perceptions of improvements in oral communication skill as more than 90% of alumni usually say their oral communication skills improved because of their experience in our program.

Reflective Statement Review:

◯ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Measure 4.1 As you didnt report last year's data, please change your reponse where you indicated "yes" on an improvement over previous year's results. I agree that Measure 4.2 is not a particularly useful measure at this point as you have acheived 100% for 2 years. AD 9/18
"In summer of 2015 a colleague and I did some restructuring of the exercises and assignments related to the written project in the course. I think our work to improve student writing has had a positive impact on this outcome as measured by students' performance on literature reviews." Even though you haven't (yet) shown improvement, this is a clear example of collecting and analyzing data via assessment to close the loop. Since you conduct assessment by calendar year, you have only 1 semster of data. Hopefully next year will show improvement! LG 9/20

Attachments: CCQ.docx   Writing and theory assessment form.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

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.

The following rubric is used to determine pass/fail of comprehensive exam:
Above Satisfactory: Student satisfactorily completes all four of the following tasks
Satisfactory: Student completes three of the four following tasks
Unsatisfactory: Student completes two or fewer of the following tasks:

Student's explanation of fundamental principles/constructs is complete, specific, and clear
Student identifies evidence in support or contradition of theoretical predictions
Student identifies specific limitations of theory.
 Student will identify underlying metatheoretical assumptions of the theory

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 Modern Communication Theory

 2/5 = above satisfactory

2/5 = satisfactory

1/5 = satisfactory

Granular data

Student's explanation of fundamental principles/constructs is complete, specific, and clear = 5/5
Student identifies evidence in support or contradition of theoretical predictions = 4/5
Student identifies specific limitations of theory. = 4/5
Student will identify underlying metatheoretical assumptions of the theory =3/5

N=18 Mass Communication Theory

7/18 = above satisfactory

7/18 = satisfactory

4/18 = below satisfactory

Granular data
Student's explanation of fundamental principles/constructs is complete, specific, and clear = 16/18
Student identifies evidence in support or contradition of theoretical predictions = 13/18
Student identifies specific limitations of theory. = 17/18
Student will identify underlying metatheoretical assumptions of the theory = No data

Total

18/23 = satisfactory or above satisfactory = 78%

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 new measure.

Review:
○ Revision or explanation needed
◉ Satisfactory

Measure: 5.2
90% of graduates who have enrolled in doctoral degree programs will report be satisfied or very satisfied with their training in communication theory.

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= 8

7 = report being very satisfied
1 = report being satisfied

100% report being satisfied or very satisfied

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 small change, we usually score in the 90 to 100% range on this item.

Review:

◯ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

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

This is the first time we measured students' ability to explain and apply communication theory in this way for outcome 5.1. This was a more granular approach and we used student papers in our communication theory courses rather than performance on time-limited comprehensive exam responses. It should be noted that one faculty member teaching the course did not require a discussion of metatheoretical assumptions so no data was available for this particular portion of the rubric. It appears that a providing evidence in support of a theoretical approach is among the most frequent problems in the students' papers. Our instructor plans to spend more time on this issue in her class in the next reporting period. Otherwise, with only one year of data, we do not plan to make any major changes to curriculum or our program. We will continue to monitor this outcome carefully moving forward.

Although our students overall had some problems in their theoretical analysis papers, our alumni who moved on to doctoral programs feel well prepared in the area of theory.

Reflective Statement Review:

○ Revision or explanation needed

◉ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Measure 5.1- Why isnt data available for the fourth component on the Mass Communication Theory granular data results? The key says to earn an Above Satisfactory 4 out of 4 sections must be satisfactorily completed. How were these exams graded? Measure 5.2 - Again it would be useful to know the response rate. Also if the results are usually 90-100%, you may want to reveiw this measure and replace it with one that can be more useful in assessment. AD 9/18

5.1=correct typo under Results (1/5 = *un*satisfactory). The attachment (with checklist) is probably sufficient to answer the reviewer's question "How were these exams graded?" although for clarity, you might add that to the results. Your reflective statement also explains why there were no data on the 4th component, so that's fine. This is another good example of using assessment to help guide curriculum changes. LG 9/20

Attachments: Writing and theory assessment form.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:

Assessment materials are all accounted for. AD 9/18

Explain EACH item checked above:

We use rubrics for assessing writing outcomes, theoretical knowledge/application, quantitative/qualitative methods responses on comprehensive examinations & thesis methods sections, and knowledge of the field based on comprehensive examination outcomes. The rubrics can be found attached in the attachments section of this report or explained in detail in the measurement sections for each outcome.

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 report a three year rolling average of a survey collected using qualtrics. We email all students who graduared in the previous calendar year (the assessment period). The survey items are attached in the attachment section of this report.

Other Survey(s):

☐ National Survey

☐ State Survey

☑ Other Survey

Explain EACH item checked above:
We surveyed internship employers regarding their observations of our students' oral communication skill. This is elaborated in measure 4.2

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: **Criteria:**

☑ 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: 2 Measure: 1

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

This change will impact, we hope, all measures for outcome 2 which is related to students learning quantitative and qualitative research methods.

We plan to change our program requirements by adding a more basic research methods course and by eliminating the requirement for a statistics course. Although scores have improved on comprehensive examinations, they did not quite meet our goals this year. We hope to improve students' scores by adding a more basic course that will be required of all students in their first semester. The course will be aimed at preparing them for the more advanced topics they will encounter in the 6000 level methods courses, especially, the quantitative course. Many of our students are either coming back after a long hiatus or are sometimes coming from an academic discipline that did not require undergraduate research methods. We hope this more basic course will prepare them to succeed in the more advanced courses.

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

We plan to use the same measures already in use for Outcome 2. The goal is to increase students' performance on those measures.

☐ 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

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:

In your results section you state that you will be changing Measure 4.2 if this is the case please discuss that here. If not please make that clear in the results section. AD 9/18
The system won't allow you to provide more than 1 planned and 1 implemented change, but you could add more text here (to address Reviewer's concern) and just make clear which Outcome/Measure it applies to. It might help with tracking changes over time. It's up to you. LG 9/20

Changes to Curriculum:

☐ Revise and/or Enforce Prerequisites
☑ Revise Course Sequence

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:
As of now, we do not require students to complete their research methods courses at any particular time in their GPS. We plan to begin requiring students to complete the new 5000 level research methods course in their first 9 hours in the program.

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

This change is aimed at improving student performance on all outcome 2 measures, so we will continue to collect data the way we do now.

☐ Revise Course Content
☐ Add Course
☐ Delete Course
☐ Other implemented or planned change
☐ No Changes to Curriculum

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.

Most of our assessment plan is new for this year, so we don't want to change the plan until we have at least two years of data.

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 program assessment and graduate faculty discussion and feedback related to assessment data.

We continue to work on establishing a more standardized and well-thought out sequence of courses for our students. In the past, curriculum mapping, assessment of student outcomes in the areas of theory and research methods has led to several changes. We made passing the core comprehensive examinations mandatory for graduation along with earning a minimum grade of B- in each of the core courses. We have added a prosemiar course to help create a common ecology of experience for first semester graduate students, many of whom did not know what to expect from graduate studies. This year, we are revising our methods curriculum to include a new, more basic, methods course all students will complete in their first nine hours to better prepare them for the more advanced courses that come later. The revisions thus far have played at least some role in improving students' performance on comp exams with a 20 to 40% increase in the rate that students pass all three core exams (quant methods, qual methods, and theory). We hope to improve this to 90% overall

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. This has decreased our admission numbers, 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' interests and motivations for beginning graduate school. Almost 80% or so come to us to improve their professional portfolio and are either updating their skills and knowledge after years in the workplace, or they are looking for a competitive advantage on the job market. This year our survey results are the lowest they've been in these students' satisfaction with how our program applies to their needs as

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

○ Revision or explanation needed

⦿ Satisfactory

Review:

It is clear that the faculty in the Communication MA program have put a lot of effort into designing and implementing an assessment plan that allows them to identify areas for improvement. They take this one step further by enacting changes based on these findings. A lot of the assessment plan is new and therefore it is recommended that data be collected for the next 2 years to allow for these measures to be fully understood. There are a couple of exceptions to this that have been noted in the results review portion.   Additionally, reporting response rates on surveys woudl be beneficial. AD 9/18 Overall, this is a great example of a program making changes to improve student learning and success. Well done! We weren't able to give credit for #8 because the few areas where improvement was noted didn't appear to be the result of assessment per se. I have a strong feeling that the changes you are making to the program this year will result in improvements next year, however. LG 9/20 Your statement here makes it clear that improvement has resulted from concrete changes in the curriculum and these have been documented in assessment reports. Well done. LG 11/28/16

professionals. This result, along with our development of a PhD program, is leading us to eliminate our current program tracks and implement two concentrations; one in professional development and one in academic preparation. We plan to develop more applied skills courses for the professional development track, some in the form of 6/4000 split level courses that combine the more hands-on experiences in the senior level courses with a strong academic component that maintains the graduate level academic rigor of our program.

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