

UCF Assessment

Assessment Plan and Results

Plan Year: Status: Results Approved for DRC Report
 Program/Unit: Last Updated: 12/21/2016 3:07:53 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: Radio/Television - B.A.	DRC: College of Sciences
Year: 2015-2016	DRC Chair: Elizabeth Grauerholz
Due Date:	Coordinator(s): Boyd Lindsley, Kim Tuorto, Stephanie Rice
	Reviewer(s): Traci Milbuta

Quick Links:

Mission:

The Radio/Television program in the Nicholson School of Communication is dedicated to serving its students, faculty, the Central Florida community and the professions associated with the field of radio/television/electronic media. The mission of the program is to provide students with core competencies, specific knowledge and applicable skills to succeed in the demanding careers associated with television and video production; audio production; broadcast journalism; broadcast and production management, sales and promotions; and web-based applications of video and audio content. The program also strives to offer high-quality, academically challenging undergraduate education to equip students with critical thinking ability and communication skills necessary to pursuing their academic and professional goals; 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 communities; **to strengthen our existing partnerships with industry and seek and develop new ones such as our latest with Universal Studios Orlando, to accept and foster more inclusivity and diversity in our admission process of students,** and to, thereby, support the mission and vision of the University of Central Florida as a whole.

Assessment Process:

1) Evaluation forms for interns completed by the intern supervisors 2) Evaluation of student work by professional panel 3) Student performance in practical/real world simulation courses. **There are 17 tools in place to assess students. All data is made available to faculty and will be used to improve areas of weakness which will be noted by professionals in our measures. Courses will then be revised to address issues in student learning.**

Relationship to Strategic Plan:

Our plans right now are heavily centered on excelling in undergraduate education and developing partnerships with the industry

and the community. Our outcomes are focused on helping us determine how to provide that education and developing those partnerships. By using internship evaluations, we not only encourage students to focus on developing their professional potential with Central Florida media outlets and producers, we also get a "real world" assessment of what our students are learning and applying. By using that evaluation data, we are able to see where our program is strong and where we need to improve our training and education. As interns are evaluated on their writing and professional skills (Outcomes 1,2,3, 5,6, and 7) we learn how well those skills are fitting in with our outside partners. As our news students are evaluated on their news judgment (Outcomes 4 and 5), we learn more about how our partners value the skills that we are teaching our students. And by soliciting that feedback on a regular basis (Outcome 8, internship counts), our partners become more involved in the development of our students and of our program. The industry partnerships help shape and strengthen the undergraduate education focus. Through our assessment of student skills by our partners, we have learned that an international focus is highly desired. We're now expanding our Hispanic media component to work with a partner institution in Spain for more Spanish language/Hispanic media opportunities. The assessment program, and the partnerships we've developed with multi-lingual outlets and what they tell us, helps shape that commitment. It also pushes us to be more aware of diversity initiatives and become focused on diversity of all types and levels.

Top

Outcome: 1

Graduates in each track will write proficiently for electronic media in their area.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

- ☒ Communication
- ☐ Critical Thinking
- ☒ Discipline-specific knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors
- ☐ Not an ALC

Measure: 1.1

Upon completion of an RTV internship, RTV student interns in Broadcast Journalism will undergo an independent evaluation by their respective internship supervisors. That evaluation will be conducted via a standardized RTV Internship Evaluation form, and requests the evaluator to rank the intern's level of expertise in critical areas of WRITTEN skills. Eighty percent (80%) of RTV Broadcast Journalism student interns will score an 8 or higher on a 10pt. scale.

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

RTV student interns in Broadcast Journalism were evaluated by their internship supervisors via a standardized RTV Internship Evaluation form, and were ranked on the performance of their WRITTEN skills on a scale from 1-10 (10 being the highest). N=15, 3 were rated 10, 4 were rated 9, 2 were rated 8, 2 were rated 7, 1 rated 6, 1 rated 5, 2 rated 4, 0 were rated 3 or below. The target was not met as 60% were rated 8 or higher.

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 52% were rated 8 or higher, an 8% increase. We added a new full-time faculty member in the fall of 2015 who has a successful track record in teaching writing courses. Previously the course was taught by an adjunct. Broadcast Journalism track was merged into Journalism. Curriculum changes were submitted to change the core writing class from Writing for the Electronic Media to News Reporting. Students this past year have begun to make the transition into taking the new required core News Reporting class. We believe this increased emphasis on writing will better prepare our students in this area for their internships and careers. So while we did not meet the target this year, we believe the increase will continue as this curriculum change is further implemented in this year's catalog.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 1.2

Upon completion of an RTV internship, RTV student interns in Broadcast Production will undergo an independent evaluation by their respective internship supervisors. That evaluation will be conducted via a standardized RTV Internship Evaluation form, and requests the evaluator to rank the intern's level of expertise in critical areas of WRITTEN skills. Eighty percent (80%) of RTV Broadcast Production student interns will score an 8 or higher on a 10pt. scale.

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

RTV student interns in Production were evaluated by their internship supervisors via a standardized RTV Internship Evaluation form, and were ranked on the performance of their WRITTEN skills on a scale from 1-10 (10 being the highest). N=40, 4 were rated 10, 11 were rated 9, 9 were rated 8, 10 were rated 7, 5 rated 6, 1 rated 5, 0 were rated 4 or below. The target was not met as 60% were rated 8 or higher. The target was not met as 60% of the production students scored 8 or higher.

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

- ☐ Yes
☒ No

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

Although the target was not met of 8 or higher, we found that 85% did at least score 7 or higher.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 1.3

Upon completion of an RTV internship, RTV student interns in Broadcast Generalist will undergo an independent evaluation by their respective internship supervisors. That evaluation will be conducted via a standardized RTV Internship Evaluation form, and requests the evaluator to rank the intern's level of expertise in critical areas of WRITTEN skills. Eighty percent (80%) of RTV Broadcast Generalist student interns will score an 8 or higher on a 10pt. scale.

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

RTV student interns in the generalist track were evaluated by their internship supervisors via a standardized RTV Internship Evaluation form, and were ranked on the performance of their WRITTEN skills on a scale from 1-10 (10 being the highest). N=18, 2 were rated 10, 6 were rated 9, 4 were rated 8, 3 were rated 7, 1 rated 6, 1 rated 5, 0 were rated 4, 1 rated 3, 0 were rated 2 or below. The target was not met as 67% of the generalist students scored 8 or higher.

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 78% scored 8 or higher compared to 67% this year for the generalist track. We are concerned about this downward trend, we will need to look into this a bit further.

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).

Broadcast Journalism track was merged into Journalism. Curriculum changes were submitted to

change the core writing class from Writing for the Electronic Media to News Reporting. Students this past year have begun to make the transition into taking the new required core News Reporting class. We believe this increased emphasis on writing will better prepare our students in this area for their internships and careers. We also added a new full-time faculty member (previously taught by an adjunct) in the fall of 2015 who has a successful track record in teaching writing courses. The RTV faculty have had discussions and plan to review, revise and update the curriculum in this next academic year for Broadcast Production and Generalist track students. This assessment will help us make the necessary improvements to improve student learning in our writing courses.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Target not met on all three measures of outcome one was directly linked to the merger of the Broadcast Journalism track into the Journalism major. The inclusion of this outcome from year to year provides your program with the data required to address, and make appropriate adjustments to curriculum needs within the content areas of concern. The justification and plan for measure one is explained and should assist with closing the loop. And it appears that curriculum discussions are on the agenda for next academic year. Has consideration been given to expanding the evaluation or looking at the qualitative responses to see if there are any patterns in the specifics evaluators feel interns are lacking in their writing skills? This may assist in addressing the needs of measures two and three. TM 12/4/16

- Zack's notes 12/21/16
- Measure 1.1:
 - The data is good. The necessary data is included and some granular data (breakdown of how many students scored 10s, 9s, etc.) is included.
 - Good discussion of what may contributed to improvement, however were these things that the program did intentionally to try and improve writing skills in students, or were these changes made for other reasons and the improvement is a happy bi-product. For example, the hiring of the new faculty member with experience in teaching writing, did the program seek to hire someone with experience teaching writing so that they could teach the writing course? Also were the curriculum/program changes made in an effort to improve student learning or were they made for other reasons? In order to "close the loop" we are supposed to use past assessment data to recognize an area that needs improvement, make a change to intentionally try to create that improvement, and record new data to see if the change caused improvement. So, if you can state that it will provide better evidence for closing the loop.
- Measure 1.2:
 - When it asks if the results showed improvement, please include last year's data so that we can see the difference in improvement or decline. Also some discussion of what may have caused the decline and what the program might do to create improvement going forward would be helpful.
 - Otherwise, the data is good.
- Measure 1.3:
 - The data is good.
 - I know you said that you are concerned about the decline in ratings and will have to look into it. Any discussion you could provide about possible causes or things the program might do to create improvement going forward would be helpful.
- Reflective Statement:
 - Pretty good reflective statement. Good discussion of what may be causing the improvement for the journalism students. Good mention that the program will revise the curriculum to help the production and generalist tracks. As I mentioned in my comments for measure 1.1 be sure to be specific if you can about what changes have been or will be made and why those changes were made.

Attachments: RTVBroadcastProductionInternEval.pdf RTV Broadcast Generalist Intern Eval.pdf
RTVBroadcastJournalismInternshipEval.pdf

Top

Outcome: 2

Graduates will be able to speak knowledgeably in business settings appropriate to their career path.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

- ☒ Communication
- ☐ Critical Thinking
- ☒ Discipline-specific knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors
- ☐ Not an ALC

Measure: 2.1

Upon completion of an RTV internship, RTV student interns will undergo an independent evaluation by their respective internship supervisors. That evaluation will be conducted via a standardized RTV Internship Evaluation form, and requests the evaluator to rank the intern's level of expertise in critical areas of VERBAL skills. Eighty percent (80%) of RTV student interns will score a 7 on a 10pt scale.

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

RTV student interns were evaluated by their internship supervisors via a standardized RTV Internship Evaluation form, and were ranked on the performance of their VERBAL skills on a scale from 1-10 (10 being the highest). N=74, 10 were rated 10, 16 were rated 9, 17 were rated 8, 11 were rated 7, 3 rated 6, 7 rated 5, 2 were rated 4, 2 were rated 3, 0 rated 2 or below. The target was not met as 73% were rated 7 or higher. Looking at granular data 5 out of 41 (12%) students in the production track scored below 7; 5 out of 15 students (33%) students in the BJ track scored below 7; 3 out of 18 students (16%) in the generalist track scored below 7.

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 95% of the students were rated as 7 or higher by their intern supervisors. The results this year are more in line with two year's ago results that were 76%.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 2.2

Students should show increased ability to discuss their major area using appropriate terms and sequences. This will be measured through internship evaluations. Upon completion of an RTV internship, RTV student interns will undergo an independent evaluation by their respective internship supervisors. That evaluation will be conducted via a standardized RTV Internship Evaluation form, and requests the evaluator to rank the intern's level of expertise in critical areas of ADEQUATE PREPARATION FOR THE INTERNSHIP. Eighty percent (80%) of RTV student interns will score a 7 on a 10pt scale.

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

RTV student interns were evaluated by their internship supervisors via a standardized RTV Internship Evaluation form, and were ranked on the performance of adequate preparation for the internship on a scale from 1-10 (10 being the highest). N=72 RTV students, 17 were rated 10, 26 were rated 9, 10 were rated 8, 9 were rated 7, 3 rated 6, 5 rated 5, 1 was rated 4, 0 were rated 3, 1 was rated 2, 0 below 2. The target was met as 86% were rated 7 or higher. Looking at granular data 5 out of 41 students (12%) in the production track scored below 7; 3 out of 14 students (21%) in the Broadcast Journalism track scored below 7; 2 out of 17 students (12%) in the generalist track scored below 7.

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 95% of the students scored 7 or higher, this year there was a 9% decrease to 86%.

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).

Although the target was not met on verbal skills, we are pleased with the results that the intern supervisors felt the interns were adequately prepared. We will continue to monitor results on verbal skills in the next cycle. We are also beginning to incorporate interview and presentation skills in the capstone courses.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☒ Revision or explanation needed
- ☐ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

The inclusion of the granular data is helpful in addressing the needs of each specific track. Would like to see this granular data in the explanation of results. Also, the reflective statement should address the decrease from last year's results. Were last year's result cohort based (one-time) or did the program make curriculum/faculty changes that contributed to lower ratings? However, it is commendable that the program was able to determine the need to include two new sections within the capstone course. This should help to reach targets for next year. TM 12/4/16

- Zack's notes 12/21/16
 - Measure 2.1:
 - Good data. Good inclusion of granular data.
 - I find it interesting that there was a big spike in performance last year and then this year's results dropped back down to the same as two years ago. Some discussion of what may have caused last year's spike or this year's decline would be helpful. Additionally, some discussion of what the program might do create improvement going forward would be helpful and might set you up to close the loop in the future.
 - Measure 2.2:
 - Good data. Good inclusion of granular data.
 - As with measure 2.1 some discussion of what may have caused the decline would be helpful. and any discussion of what the program might do going forward to try to create improvement would be good.
 - Reflective Statement:
 - Again here, some discussion of what may have contributed to the results would be good. Good mention of the incorporation of interview and presentation skills into the capstone course, but be sure to indicate whether or not this is something the program is doing in an effort to improve scores or if it is being done for other reasons.

Attachments: RTV Broadcast Generalist Intern Eval.pdf RTVBroadcastProductionInternEval.pdf RTVBroadcastJournalismInternshipEval.pdf

Top

Outcome: 3

Production graduates will be able to produce video, audio or multimedia projects that are of professional quality.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

- ☐ Communication
- ☐ Critical Thinking
- ☒ Discipline-specific knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors
- ☐ Not an ALC

Measure: 3.1

A sample of student production projects from senior classes will be submitted to a panel of

professionals to evaluate using a standard rubric. Seventy per cent of the student projects will be evaluated at an overall average of 3 on a 5-point scale.

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

Students produced a community spotlight project in relation to WUCF-TV and their website. Two producers scored their projects using a 5 point scale (5 being the highest) rating the professional quality of the production elements (lighting, audio, videography). In spring 5 out of 6 (83%) received a 3 or higher on all elements; in the fall 9 out of 11, (82%) received a 3 or higher on all elements. Overall 82% met the professional quality production elements; the target was met.

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 we focused on one production project that the professionals evaluated with more specific criteria than the method used last year on numerous projects. We felt this process would provide more meaningful feedback on student learning and professional development.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 3.2

Production students should participate in the out of class opportunities for production experience in one of three ways: 1. an appropriate production internship in the field, 2. programming produced through the division and/or 3. production in connection with a practicum. A sample of student production work from these out of class experiences will be evaluated by a professional panel utilizing a standardized rubric. A minimum of 70 per cent of the productions evaluated will be ranked a minimum of 3 on a 5-point scale.

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

Students in the Broadcast Production capstone course were rated on their performance as crew members on the final studio production project an entertainment variety show. Out of 11 students, 8 students (73%) in the fall semester scored 3 or higher on their professional production skills (creativity/originality, technical proficiency, visualization, audio) by an outside industry professional. In the spring semester 4 out of 6 (66%) scored 3 or higher. The target was met with 71% for the year.

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 we decided to focus this measure on the production capstone course. Last reporting cycle this measure also included internships that are also reported in measure 7.2. To make this assessment more meaningful we wanted to avoid duplication and for consistency.

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 feel this new assessment is valuable and will continue the trend, we met the target and hope to continue to improve.

Reflective Statement Review:

☐ Revision or explanation needed

☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

While the move to evaluating one project only showed improvement in one measure, it allows for focused feedback that should continue to help students produce quality work. This focused objective should yield improvement in the overall success of this outcome. TM 12/4/16

- Zack's notes 12/21/16
 - Measure 3.1:
 - Good data. Good disaggregate data of including fall and spring as well as the overall data.
 - Another great piece of disaggregate data you could include, and that might help the program, would be providing the scores on each section of the rubric. Was there a particular area of the production assignment that proved more difficult for students than another? Any trends you can see in the scores of lighting vs audio vs videography? Looking at that data might help the program find specific areas that the progra might want to focus on.

- Since this is a different measurement approach from last year no discussion of comparisons to previous data is necessary.
- Measure 3.2:
 - Same comments as for 3.2
- Reflective Statement:
 - The reflective statement is sufficient considering these are new measurement approaches it makes sense to maybe collect another year of data before making changes.

Attachments: RTV Broadcast Generalist Intern Eval.pdf RTVBroadcastProductionInternEval.pdf RTVBroadcastJournalismInternshipEval.pdf RTV Production Rubric.doc

Top

Outcome: 4

Broadcast Journalism graduates will be able to analyze news situations and make sound decisions as to the areas that should be included and emphasized.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

- ☐ Communication
- ☒ Critical Thinking
- ☒ Discipline-specific knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors
- ☐ Not an ALC

Measure: 4.1

Eighty percent (80%) of students in the broadcast journalism capstone course, RTV 4320C, will have a minimum of 2 stories per week story ideas approved for inclusion into one of the student-produced newscasts airing on the UCF Channel or approved for publishing on the Knightly News Website.

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

Students in the broadcast journalism capstone course, RTV 3420C were required to produce a minimum of two stories per week; 8 out of 9 (88%) successfully produced two stories or more for the newscast or website per week for the fall semester. In the spring semester 9 out of 11 (81%) successfully produced two stories or more for the newscast or website per week. Therefore, the target was met as over the year 85% met the two story minimum.

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 83% met the minimum, compared to 85% this reporting cycle.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 4.2

A rubric will be used to evaluate student assignments in the RTV 3304 (EJII) class. The rubric will identify how well students have mastered the tasks necessary to produce broadcast quality news packages. Eighty percent (80%) students in the RTV 3304 class should score a minimum of 4 on a 5-point scale.

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

Students in the RTV 3304 were evaluated on their ability to produce broadcast quality news packages. In the spring 9 out of 11 students (82%) were rated 4 or higher on their ability to produce quality news packages. In the fall 13 of 15 students (87%) scored 4 on a 5-point scale on news packages. The total was 85% for the year that rated 4 or higher, the target was met.

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's results were exactly the same as last year's.

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).

Broadcast Journalism students are groomed to produce multiple stories simultaneously from early in their specialization. It is apparent that they fulfill this expectation in these two upper level project

driven courses.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☒ Revision or explanation needed
- ☐ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Broadcast Journalism students seemed well prepared to successfully fulfill the upper level projects. However, the reflective statement did not address the static results of measure 4.2. As this measure has been consistent and has not improved over the last two assessments, what can be changed to reflect improvement next year? TM 12/4/16

- Zack's notes 12/21/16
- Measure 4.1:
 - The data is good. Since there was no improvement/decline and the target was met there is not a lot of discussion needed, but of course any discussion of what may have contributed to results and what the program might do to create improvement would be good.
- Measure 4.2:
 - Similar comments to measure 3.1. Good data. Good disaggregate data of including fall and spring as well as the overall data.
 - Another great piece of disaggregate data you could include, and that might help the program, would be providing the scores on each section of the rubric. Was there a particular area of the production assignment that proved more difficult for students than another? Any trends you can see in the scores of creativity vs technical proficiency, etc.? Looking at that data might help the program find specific areas that the progra might want to focus on.
 - Since there was no improvement/decline and the target was met there is not a lot of discussion needed, but of course any discussion of what may have contributed to results and what the program might do to create improvement would be good. This helps make my point about the granular data for each section of the rubric. The overall scores may not be different from last year, but you may find that scores varied on different sections of the assignment.
- Reflective Statement:
 - With the data pretty much the same from last year and having met the target on both measures it doesn't provide you with a lot to discuss in the reflective statement. Again this is where that further granular data might be useful. It could help you discover trends and things the program can improve upon that may have gone unnotice otherwise.

Attachments: RTV_Production_Rubric.doc RTVBroadcastJournalismInternshipEval.pdf
RTVBroadcastProductionInternEval.pdf RTV Broadcast Generalist Intern Eval.pdf

Top

Outcome: 5

Broadcast Journalism graduates will be able to write and produce professional level news stories, using TV news format and editing video and audio into a coherent news story.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

- ☒ Communication
- ☐ Critical Thinking
- ☒ Discipline-specific knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors
- ☐ Not an ALC

Measure: 5.1

Upon completion of an RTV internship, RTV student interns will undergo an independent evaluation by their respective internship supervisors. That evaluation will be conducted via a standardized RTV Internship Evaluation form, and requests the evaluator to rank the intern's level of expertise in critical areas of INTERN DEMONSTRATES CREATIVITY OR RESOURCEFULNESS IN HIS/HER APPROACH TO GATHERING GATHERING INFORMATION ABOUT A STORY. Eighty percent (80%) of RTV student interns will score a 7 on a 10pt scale.

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

RTV student interns in Broadcast Journalism were evaluated by their internship supervisors via a standardized RTV Internship Evaluation form, and were ranked on their ability to demonstrate creativity or resourcefulness in his/her approach to gathering information about a story on a scale from 1-10 (10 being the highest). N=14, 2 were rated 10, 3 were rated 9, 4 were rated 8, 2 were rated 7, 1 was rated 6, 2 were rated 5, 0 were rated 4 or below. The target was not met as 79% were rated 7 or higher.

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 we were only 1% away from meeting our target, last year 85% of the students scored a 7 or higher. This year there was a 6% decrease from the prior year's results.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 5.2

Upon completion of an RTV internship, RTV student interns will undergo an independent evaluation by their respective internship supervisors. That evaluation will be conducted via a standardized RTV Internship Evaluation form, and requests the evaluator to rank the intern's level of expertise in critical areas of INTERN WAS ABLE TO CONTRIBUTE TO PRODUCT, NOT JUST SHADOW. Eighty percent (80%) of RTV student interns will score a 7 on a 10pt scale.

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

RTV student interns in Broadcast Journalism (the only track this measure is used for) were evaluated by their internship supervisors via a standardized RTV Internship Evaluation form, and were ranked on their ability to contribute substantially to the product, not just observe or shadow on a scale from 1-10 (10 being the highest). N=15, 4 were rated 10, 5 were rated 9, 2 were rated 8, 2 were rated 7, 0 were rated 6, 2 were rated 5, 0 were rated 4 or below. The target was met as 87% were rated 7 or higher.

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 we did have a slight (2%) increase from last year's 85% were rated 7 or higher.

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 feel these results are a good reflection of our program. Although the target was not met of 5.1 by 1%, we will continue to encourage students to focus on creativity and resourcefulness.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☐ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

The percentage of interns supervisors ranked as quality contributors is a strong reflection of the quality program offered. Despite being short of meeting the target by 1%, measure 5.1 reflected a significant decrease from last year. Reflective statement should address any changes that could have resulted in these results. TM 12/4/16

- Zack's notes 12/21/16
- Measure 5.1:
 - Similar comments to previous measures. The data is good. We would like to see some discussion of what may have contributed to the decline and what the program might do to create improvement going forward.
- Measure 5.2:

- Similar comments. The data is good. We would like to see some discussion of what may have contributed to the improved scores and what the program might do to create improvement going forward.
- Reflective Statment:
 - Again here discussion of the results, what may have contributed to getting the results you did, and what the program might do moving forward to create improvement.

Attachments: RTV Broadcast Generalist Intern Eval.pdf RTVBroadcastProductionInternEval.pdf
RTVBroadcastJournalismInternshipEval.pdf

Top

Outcome: 6

Graduates will demonstrate professional characteristics including organization, initiative, and deadline responsibilities.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

- ☐ Communication
- ☐ Critical Thinking
- ☐ Discipline-specific knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors
- ☒ Not an ALC

Measure: 6.1

Upon completion of an RTV internship, RTV student interns will undergo an independent evaluation by their respective internship supervisors. That evaluation will be conducted via a standardized RTV Internship Evaluation form, and requests the evaluator to rank the intern's level of expertise in the critical area of ORGANIZATIONAL skills. Eighty percent (80%) of RTV student interns will score an 8 or higher on a 10pt. scale.

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

RTV student interns were evaluated by their internship supervisors via a standardized RTV Internship Evaluation form, and were ranked on the intern's level of expertise in organizational skills for the internship on a scale from 1-10 (10 being the highest). N=73 RTV students, 13 were rated 10, 21 were rated 9, 17 were rated 8, 11 were rated 7, 1 was rated 6, 5 rated 5, 3 were rated 4, 1 was rated 3, 0 were rated 2, 1 was rated 1. The target was not met as 70% were rated 8 or higher. Looking at granular data 12 out of 40 students (30%) in the production track scored below 8; 6 out of 15 students (40%) in the Broadcast Journalism track scored below 8; 6 out of 18 students (33%) in the generalist track scored below 8.

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 we had an 8% decrease from last year's 78%. Scoring 8 or higher seems to be a stretch target for this measure.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 6.2

Upon completion of an RTV internship, RTV student interns will undergo an independent evaluation by their respective internship supervisors. That evaluation will be conducted via a standardized RTV Internship Evaluation form, and requests the evaluator to rank the intern's level of expertise in the critical area of DEADLINE RESPONSIBILITY. Eighty percent (80%) of RTV student interns will score a 7 or higher on a 10pt. scale.

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

RTV student interns were evaluated by their internship supervisors via a standardized RTV Internship Evaluation form, and were ranked on their deadline responsibility for the internship on a scale from 1-10 (10 being the highest). N=71 RTV students, 22 were rated 10, 20 were rated 9, 10 were rated 8, 10 were rated 7, 5 were rated 6, 2 were rated 5, 1 was rated 4, 1 was rated 3, 0 were rated 2 or below. The target was met as 87% were rated 7 or higher. Looking at granular data 4 out of 39 students (10%) in the production track scored below 7; 4 out of 15 students (27%) in the Broadcast Journalism track scored below 7; 1 out of 17 students (6%) in the generalist track scored below 7.

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 year's results showed a 6% decrease from 94% last year.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 6.3

Upon completion of an RTV internship, RTV student interns will undergo an independent evaluation by their respective internship supervisors. That evaluation will be conducted via a standardized RTV Internship Evaluation form, and requests the evaluator to rank the intern's level of expertise in the critical area of INITIATIVE. Eighty percent (80%) of RTV student interns will score an 8 or higher on a 10pt. scale.

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

RTV student interns were evaluated by their internship supervisors via a standardized RTV Internship Evaluation form, and were ranked on the intern's level of initiative for the internship on a scale from 1-10 (10 being the highest). N=73 RTV students, 23 were rated 10, 19 were rated 9, 13 were rated 8, 4 were rated 7, 6 were rated 6, 2 were rated 5, 2 were rated 4, 2 were rated 3, 1 was rated 2, 1 was rated 1. The target was not met as 75% were rated 8 or higher. Looking at granular data 9 out of 41 students (22%) in the production track scored below 8; 4 out of 15 students (27%) in the Broadcast Journalism track scored below 8; 5 out of 17 students (29%) in the generalist track scored below 8.

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's results show a 7% decrease from last year's 82%.

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).

While the students seem to understand the importance of deadlines and meeting them in this field, we plan to emphasize more organizational skills in the core courses in preparation to improve results in future cycles. Initiative continues to be a problem for millennial students, however, these life skills can be stressed more in specialization courses.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed

● Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Unfortunately most disciplines are faced with the problems of teaching these life skills/necessities to today's millennial students. With the continued decrease in each of the measures under objective six, I wonder if limiting curriculum changes to only a portion of required courses may not be enough. The program might consider including modules on each of the three areas in all major required courses.
TM 12/4/16

- Zack's notes 12/21/16
 - Measure 6.1:
 - Same comments as previous measures. Good data. Please include discussion of what may have contributed to results and what the program might do to create improvement going forward.
 - Measure 6.2:
 - Same comments as 6.1
 - Measure 6.3:
 - Same comments.
 - Reflective Statement:
 - Good discussion of what the program intends to do to create improvement going forward.
 - We would like to see some discussion as to what contributed to the results.

Attachments: RTVBroadcastJournalismInternshipEval.pdf RTVBroadcastProductionInternEval.pdf
RTV Broadcast Generalist Intern Eval.pdf

Top

Outcome: 7

Production graduates will demonstrate professional level skills using equipment required for RTV production.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

- ☐ Communication
- ☐ Critical Thinking
- ☒ Discipline-specific knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors
- ☐ Not an ALC

Measure: 7.1

Upon completion of an RTV internship, RTV PRODUCTION-TRACK student interns will undergo an independent evaluation by their respective internship supervisors. That evaluation will be conducted via a standardized RTV Internship Evaluation form, and requests the evaluator to rank the intern's level of expertise in the critical skills areas of PRODUCTION skills (AUDIO, LIGHTING, SCRIPTING, VISUAL COMPOSITION, EDITING, POST-PRODUCTION PROCESS). Eighty percent (80%) of RTV production student interns will average 8 or higher across those six skills.

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

RTV Production track students were evaluated by their internship supervisors via a standardized RTV Internship Evaluation form, and were ranked on the intern's level of expertise in the critical skills areas of PRODUCTION skills (AUDIO, LIGHTING, SCRIPTING, VISUAL COMPOSITION, EDITING, POST-PRODUCTION PROCESS) for the internship on a scale from 1-10 (10 being the highest). **Visual Composition** N=40 students, 5 were rated 10, 19 were rated 9, 9 were rated 8, 4 were rated 7, 1 was rated 6, 1 was rated 5, 1 was rated 4, 0 were rated 3 or below. Total 83% **Audio** N= 40 students, 5 were rated 10, 18 were rated 9, 8 were rated 8, 7 were rated 7, 1 was rated 6, 1 was rated 5, 0 were rated 4 or below. Total 78% **Lighting** N= 40 students, 5 were rated 10, 13 were rated 9, 12 were rated 8, 4 were rated 7, 0 were rated 6, 4 were rated 5, 2 were rated 4, 0 were rated 3 or below. Total 75% **Post-Production** N= 40 students, 9 were rated 10, 16 were rated 9, 9 were rated 8, 5 were rated 7, 1 was rated 6, 0 was rated 5, 1 were rated 4, or below. Total 85% **Scripting** N= 40 students, 6 were rated 10, 13 were rated 9, 12 were rated 8, 7 were rated 7, 1 was rated 6, 1 was rated 5, 0 were rated 4 or below. Total 78% **Production** N= 41 students, 10 were rated 10, 12 were rated 9, 9 were rated 8, 7 were rated 7, 1 was rated 6, 2 were rated 5, 0 were rated 4 or below. Total 76% **Average across the six skills:** N= 41 students, 7 were rated 10, 15 were rated 9, 10 were rated 8, 6 were rated 7, 1 was rated 6, 1 was rated 5, 1 was rated 4, 0 were rated 3 or below. The target was not met as 78% of the students averaged 8 or higher across the six skills for the production track.

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's results reflect an increase of 13% from last year's 65%.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 7.2

Upon completion of an RTV internship, RTV PRODUCTION-TRACK student interns will undergo an independent evaluation by their respective internship supervisors. That evaluation will be conducted via a standardized RTV Internship Evaluation form, and requests the evaluator to rank the intern's PROFESSIONAL POTENTIAL. Eighty percent (80%) of RTV production student interns will score a an 8 or higher on a 10pt. scale.

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

RTV student interns in Production were evaluated by their internship supervisors via a standardized RTV Internship Evaluation form, and were ranked on their professional potential on a scale from 1-10 (10 being the highest). N=41, 13 were rated 10, 14 were rated 9, 4 were rated 8, 4 were rated 7, 2 were rated 6, 1 was rated 5, 1 was rated 4, 2 were rated 3, 0 were rated 2 or below. The target was not met as 76% of the production students scored 8 or higher.

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's results was a decrease from last year's 98%.

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).

These results show that our students are strong in composition, framing, and editing. Emphasis needs to be placed on audio capture, lighting set-ups and scriptwriting in Production classes; with this emphasis we should be able to meet our target in future assessment cycles.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☒ Revision or explanation needed
☐ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

Despite being a few percentage points away from meeting the overall target for 7.1, the program should be extremely pleased with the dramatic improvement from last year's numbers. This is a commendable increase. However, the 22% decrease in 7.2 should be further addressed in the reflective statement. It is understood that outcomes results will be reflective of the cohort being measured, however, the statement is too vague and does not address specifics of the results. TM 12/4/16

- Zack's notes 12/21/16
- Measure 7.1
 - Great breakdown of disaggregate data for each rubric area. This is what I was talking about in previous measures that are set up similarly. In addition to just including the data though we would like to see some analysis of the data. What conclusions can be drawn by looking at the individual sections of the rubric? For example Audio, Lighting, Scripting, and Production were all below the 80% mark, while Visual Composition and Post Production were above the 80% target. Perhaps that tells the program that more attention needs to be paid to the areas that scored lower.
 - As with other measures, great data, but we'd like to see some analysis/discussion. You saw a 13% improvement. What may have caused it? While you saw improvement you were still below the target. What might the program do to improve results to meet the

target next year?

- Measure 7.2:
 - Same comments as previous measures. Good data. We'd like to see analysis. What contributed to the results (in this case a decline from previous year)? What might the program do to create improvement going forward?
- Reflective Statement:
 - Good analysis of the weaker areas in measure 7.1 and what the program will do to create improvement (better specifics in regard to what it means to place more emphasis on these areas would be good.) We'd like to see some analysis related to what contributed the results you got.

Attachments: RTV Broadcast Generalist Intern Eval.pdf RTVBroadcastProductionInternEval.pdf RTVBroadcastJournalismInternshipEval.pdf

Top

Outcome: 8

Eighty percent of students in the Broadcast Journalism and Production tracks, and fifty per cent of students in the Generalist track, will successfully complete an internship before graduation.

Academic Learning Compact (ALC):

- ☐ Communication
- ☐ Critical Thinking
- ☒ Discipline-specific knowledge, skills, attitudes and behaviors
- ☐ Not an ALC

Measure: 8.1

Eighty percent of students in the Broadcast Journalism and Production tracks shall complete an appropriate internship. This will be determined by a review of the academic audits for the graduating students in these tracks and their internship evaluation forms.

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

Of the 66 students that were graduating 56 students (41 Production students and 15 Broadcast Journalism) completed internships. As 85% of the students' completed an internship, the target was met.

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 results show 95% of the students in the two tracks completed internships. This year although we met the target with 85% completing internships. Looking at the granular data only 58% of the Broadcast Journalism students completed internships this year. Anecdotally, we think have heard what seems to be a larger number of Broadcast Journalism students that are already working due to other senior level coursework/ experiences such as Knightly News, so they didn't need to do an internship. We will have to monitor this moving forward to see if this is a trend.

Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Measure: 8.2

Fifty percent of students in the Generalist track shall complete an appropriate internship. This will be determined by a review of the academic audits for the graduating students in this track and their internship evaluation forms.

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

Of the 45 students that were graduating 17 students in the Broadcast Generalist track completed internships. The target was not met as only 38% of Broadcast Generalist student's completed internships.

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 91% completed internships and the year before 62% had completed internships. This year only 38% of Broadcast Generalist completed internships.

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 need to do a better job of advising and career counseling of generalist track students. Internships for this track are not as plentiful, but we need to do a better job of forging new relationships in non-production areas of the industry. The RTV faculty have had discussions and plan to review, revise and update the curriculum in this next academic year for Broadcast Production and Generalist track students. Additionally we will be forming a curriculum advisory committee made of industry professionals to assist us with the task of identifying more opportunities for our non-production students.

Reflective Statement Review:

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Overall Outcome Results Review Comment:

All disciplines face the difficulty of relaying the importance to students of these types of experiences post-graduation. With the increase of non-traditional students, encouraging these opportunities gets harder as students have other full-time responsibilities outside of school. However, Radio/TV seems to have an understanding of its importance and is taking appropriate measures to improve this outcome. TM 12/4/16

- Zack's notes 12/21/16
- Measure 8.1:
 - Good data. And good analysis of what may have contributed to the decline.
- Measure 8.2:
 - Good data. As with previous measures we would like to see some analysis. What contributed to the decline? What might the program do to create improvement?
- Reflective Statement:
 - Good analysis about better counseling of generalist track students, the scarcity of internships for them, and the need for the program to forge new relationships in the industry.
 - Good plan to review the curriculum, but any specific ideas about what the program might do in that regard would be helpful.
 - Good plan to form a committee of industry professionals to identify more opportunities for students.

Attachments: RTVBroadcastJournalismInternshipEval.pdf RTVBroadcastProductionInternEval.pdf
RTV Broadcast Generalist Intern Eval.pdf

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:

Students will be evaluated by faculty using a rubric for senior level projects and/or capstone course.
Intern supervisors will evaluate students by use of internship evaluation.

Review:

- ☒ Revision or explanation needed
- ☐ Satisfactory

Review Comments:

The methods being currently being used are appropriate and provides data the program can use to make any necessary changes. Should be updated to reflect the use of rubrics and observation. I would suggest the program consider including a graduation survey. This will allow students to provide input on areas they felt were missing or lacking throughout their program. This data can be useful to programs looking to make improvements, especially after years of decrease. TM 12/4/16

- Zack's notes 12/21/16

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:**Other Survey(s):**

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

- Most of the necessary items are checked here. I agree with the reviewer that rubrics should also probably be checked.
- In the explanations we would like to see 1) What instrument is being used 2) What data the instrument is collecting 3) What measure/outcome the instrument is tied to.
 - For example: "We use Internship Supervisor Evaluation forms in outcome 1, 2, To assess student skills in areas such as written skills, verbal skills, preparedness,"

Explain EACH item checked above:**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
- ☐ Make Technology Related Improvements
- ☒ Make Personnel Related Changes

Is this an implemented or planned change?

- ☒ Implemented Change
- ☐ Planned Change
- ☐ Both

Implemented change in current 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 did you bring about a change?

Outcome: 1 Measure: 2**Explain the strategy that you implemented to bring about the change:**

Hired a new full-time faculty member with extensive experience teaching writing courses.

Describe the data that you collected to assess the change:

RTV student interns in Production were evaluated by their internship supervisors via a standardized RTV Internship Evaluation form, and were ranked on the performance of their WRITTEN skills on a scale from 1-10 (10 being the highest). N=40, 4 were rated 10, 11 were rated 9, 9 were rated 8, 10 were rated 7, 5 rated 6, 1 rated 5, 0 were rated 4 or below. The target was not met as 60% were rated 8 or higher. The target was not met as 60% of the production students scored 8 or higher.

Describe Improvement(s):

(If baseline data or no improvement, please explain next steps)
Broadcast Journalism track was merged into Journalism.
Curriculum changes were submitted to change the core writing

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:

Based off last years plan, personnel and curriculum changes were put into place. Results from these changes should be reflected. TM 12/4/16

- Zack's notes 12/21/16
- First change:
 - As I mentioned in my comments for outcome 1 I wonder if the hiring of the new faculty and merging of the tracks was done because of assessment and with goal improving the results of these measures.
 - Remember to close the loop the change has to be made because you used past assessment results to notice an area that needed improvement and then you made a change specifically designed to create that improvement. If you

class from Writing for the Electronic Media to News Reporting. Students this past year have begun to make the transition into taking the new required core News Reporting class. We believe this increased emphasis on writing will better prepare our students in this area for their internships and careers. We also added a new full-time faculty member (previously taught by an adjunct) in the fall of 2015 who has a successful track record in teaching writing courses. The RTV faculty have had discussions and plan to review, revise and update the curriculum in this next academic year for Broadcast Production and Generalist track students. This assessment will help us make the necessary improvements to improve student learning in our writing courses.

- ☐ 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

Is this an implemented or planned change?

- ☐ Implemented Change
- ☐ Planned Change
- ☒ Both

Implemented change in current 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 did you bring about a change?

Outcome: 1 Measure: 1

Explain the strategy that you implemented to bring about the change:

Broadcast Journalism students are now required to take News Reporting as part of the core which is a more intensive writing skills course. This curriculum change was approved this past academic year and will be implemented in 2016-2017 catalog. Through advisement some students have already begun to take this course.

Describe the data that you collected to assess the change:

could make it clear that these changes were done with that process in mind then this might be a good example of closed loop.

- In relation to reviewing the curriculum to make possible changes. Be sure to be specific about what changes are being made and why when it comes time to write the plan.
- Second Change:
 - Implemented: Same comments as first change.
 - Planned: Good discussion of plans to forge new partnerships and create the industry member panel. When it comes to the curriculum changes again be sure to be specific about what those are.

RTV student interns in Broadcast Journalism were evaluated by their internship supervisors via a standardized RTV Internship Evaluation form, and were ranked on the performance of their WRITTEN skills on a scale from 1-10 (10 being the highest). N=15, 3 were rated 10, 4 were rated 9, 2 were rated 8, 2 were rated 7, 1 rated 6, 1 rated 5, 2 rated 4, 0 were rated 3 or below. The target was not met as 60% were rated 8 or higher.

Describe Improvement(s):

(If baseline data or no improvement, please explain next steps)

Broadcast Journalism track was merged into Journalism. Curriculum changes were submitted to change the core writing class from Writing for the Electronic Media to News Reporting. Students this past year have begun to make the transition into taking the new required core News Reporting class. We believe this increased emphasis on writing will better prepare our students in this area for their internships and careers. We also added a new full-time faculty member (previously taught by an adjunct) in the fall of 2015 who has a successful track record in teaching writing courses. The RTV faculty have had discussions and plan to review, revise and update the curriculum in this next academic year for Broadcast Production and Generalist track students. This assessment will help us make the necessary improvements to improve student learning in our writing courses.

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: 8 Measure: 2

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

We need to do a better job of advising and career counseling of generalist track students. Internships for this track are not as plentiful, but we need to do a better job of forging new relationships in non-production areas of the industry. The RTV faculty have had discussions and plan to review, revise and update the curriculum in this next academic year for Broadcast Production and Generalist track students. Additionally we will be forming a curriculum advisory committee made of industry professionals to assist us with the task of identifying more opportunities for our non-production students.

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

Of the 45 students that were graduating 17 students in the Broadcast Generalist track completed internships. The target was not met as only 38% of Broadcast Generalist student's

completed internships.

We will continue to monitor the number of internship vs. graduation rates for the Broadcast Generalist track once as our advisory board is established and help connect us to other industry professionals to provide more internships for the generalist track student.

If revisions to curriculum are made for the production and generalist track we will collect data as needed and possibly revise student learning outcomes and measures as needed.

- ☐ 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.

See changes above.

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).

During this assessment cycle we hired a new full-time faculty member to with extensive experience in teaching writing. We have made curriculum changes 2016-17 including moving Broadcast Journalism into the Journalism program. We have retracted the core courses for Broadcast Journalism students instead of taking Writing for the Electronic Media, they are now required to take the more in-depth News Reporting course as part of the core courses. Based on some the results of this assessment the faculty plan to review, revise and update the Broadcast Production and Generalist tracks. We also plan to establish an advisory committee of industry professionals that can help us make connections to professionals in the industry and help us identify more internship opportunities for our Broadcast Generalist track students.

Review Criteria:

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

- ☐ Revision or explanation needed
- ☒ Satisfactory

Review:

While this assessment answered all of the relevant questions, more details could be added in several of the reflective statements to address needed improvements. Including this data will help in outlining the necessary steps to closing outstanding loops. If this information is added, this assessment could move to accomplished. TM 12/4/16

- Zack's notes 12/21/16
- I agree with the reviewer more analysis and discussion of results is

desired. I also question whether or not some of the changes that were made that resulted in improvement were made because of assessment or if they were made for other reasons and improved assessment results were a happy bi-product. I've decided to give the program the benefit of the doubt and have given credit for closing the loop.

- Please see the comments throughout the report to help you strengthen future reports.

Site maintained by Operational Excellence and Assessment Support

[Terms of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Webmaster](#)