

Student Learning Summary Form AY2015-16

Due to your dean by June 1

Due from dean to assessment office by June 15

Degree Program Name: Communication Contact Name and Email Shana Kopaczewski (shana.kopaczewski@indstate.edu)

Part One

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year? If this is a graduate program, indicate the Graduate Student Learning Outcome* each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. (1) What method(s) did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</p>	<p>c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual results?</p>	<p>e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?</p>
<p>1. Learning Outcome 7 Apply Ethical Communication Principles and Practices</p>	<p>1) First we developed a rubric to apply to course artifacts. The rubric allowed for the following ratings: 0= N/A, 1= Limited Demonstration, 2= Partial Demonstration, 3= Proficient Demonstration, and 4= Superior Demonstration. Then we collected artifacts from a key course (we requested up to 3 course artifacts of the instructor's choosing which they felt addressed the outcome being assessed). We recognize that this method only represents a direct measure, but we have not yet developed/put in place indirect measures which we plan to do in the next academic year. 2) The assessment committee identified COMM 312 as a key course for this learning outcome as it is designated as an (R), the highest level of engagement on our working curriculum map.</p>	<p>We set an expectation that the average student score (from a randomly selected sample) on these rubrics will be in the 3-4 range to indicate the outcome is being met.</p>	<p>Since artifacts were collected at the end of the Spring 2016 semester, the committee has not yet assessed the material, but has plans to do so in early Fall 2016.</p>	<p>1) The assessment committee consists of 5 members of the regular faculty, and will be primarily responsible for collecting and analyzing the results. 2) The assessment committee plans to share the results with the program faculty as a report both during a department faculty meeting, and as a document posted on the department's Blackboard Site.</p>

<p>2. Learning Outcome 9 Influence Public Discourse</p>	<p>1) First we developed a rubric to apply to course artifacts. The rubric allowed for the following ratings: 0= N/A, 1= Limited Demonstration, 2= Partial Demonstration, 3= Proficient Demonstration, and 4= Superior Demonstration. Then we collected artifacts from a key course (we requested up to 3 course artifacts of the instructor's choosing which they felt addressed the outcome being assessed) We recognize that this method only represents a direct measure, but we have not yet developed/put in place indirect measures which we plan to do in the next academic year.</p> <p>2) The assessment committee identified COMM 459 as a key course for this learning outcome as it is designated as an (R), the highest level of engagement on our working curriculum map.</p>	<p>We set an expectation that the average student score (from a randomly selected sample) on these rubrics will be in the 3-4 range to indicate the outcome is being met.</p>	<p>Since artifacts were collected at the end of the Spring 2016 semester, the committee has not yet assessed the material, but has plans to do so in early Fall 2016.</p>	<p>1) The assessment committee consists of 5 members of the regular faculty, and will be primarily responsible for collecting and analyzing the results.</p> <p>2) The assessment committee plans to share the results with the program faculty as a report both during a department faculty meeting, and as a document posted on the department's Blackboard Site.</p>
--	--	---	---	---

Part Two

Over the course of this year, the assessment committee was able to identify and address several key issues related to the department's assessment plan, curriculum, and departmental processes. The department's assessment plan was fatally flawed since its inception prior to the rollout of the department's new curriculum in Fall 2014. At the start of Fall 2015, the assessment plan still included the department's health concentration, which was put on hold and never officially made part of our curriculum. Additionally when we created that plan, we had devised learning outcomes by concentration, which essentially meant we had planned to assess 5 curricula- one for each concentration. This iteration of the assessment plan included 40+ learning outcomes to be assessed in a three year cycle. Attempting to put this plan into action was untenable and the committee made reworking the plan a priority. Based on advice from Mary Herrington-Perry in a November 6th meeting, the committee worked to simplify the outcomes by focusing on program outcomes rather than concentration outcomes. The committee researched assessment materials from the National Communication Association, and found a recommended set of nine learning outcomes for the communication discipline. The committee rewrote the assessment plan focusing on these nine programmatic outcomes and presented it to the department at the November 11th department meeting. We handed out packets, and posted the new plan to blackboard so faculty could review the plan and provide feedback. The new plan was approved at the December 2nd department meeting by a vote of 16-0-0.

Since we had just completely revamped the assessment plan and learning outcomes at the end of Fall semester, the committee quickly identified 2 outcomes and corresponding courses from which we could collect material for direct assessment in the spring. We identified Outcome 7 (Apply Ethical Communication Principles and Practices) for the COMM 312 Persuasion course and 9 (Influence Public Discourse) for the COMM 459 Communication Law class. Both courses are in our core, so they are required of all students, and the committee felt they would be an appropriate place in the curriculum to gather material for those outcomes. Instructors for all sections of those courses were notified by email on December 10th which outcome was being assessed, and that they should not tailor their course at all, but we would be collecting up to 3 artifacts from their course that they felt demonstrated the outcome for assessment, and that they should be sure to save these assignments in a shareable form so the assessment committee could collect them at the end of the semester. (As of this report, we have collected the materials, developed rubrics for outcomes 7 and 9, and plan to complete the direct assessments early in Fall 2016). The second task the committee worked on after the new plan was approved was developing a new curriculum map. The committee created a worksheet for faculty to complete indicating for each core/concentration course they taught, the degree to which each outcome would be taught and practiced by students (Introduced, Practiced, Reinforced). The worksheet was explained and distributed at the April 13th department meeting, and again was made available in electronic form through blackboard and via email. Forms were completed and returned by almost all faculty, and the information was compiled to give us a working picture of the curriculum map as it was currently being enacted. This allowed us to not only create a proposed curriculum map, but also to identify some important curricular issues in terms of sequencing and inconsistencies among faculty teaching the same course.

On April 29th, all faculty were invited to an open meeting of the assessment committee (10 total faculty were in attendance) to first discuss the issues raised by the curriculum mapping, and second to open a discussion of assessment concerns and considerations. We discussed several inconsistencies in how outcomes were being addressed in courses taught by multiple instructors, and we talked about how we could be more consistent in letting instructors know what outcomes should be covered at what level in each course. We were surprised to see advanced classes that were still introducing concepts that should have been introduced much earlier- this raised questions about course sequencing, degree mapping, and pre-requisites. Several helpful suggestions came out of the discussion, such as the need for the curriculum committee to revise our degree maps to better address sequencing issues for the concentrations and for the department to follow those maps in our course offerings, as well as a discussion of some upper level courses that currently have no pre-req's which limits the ability of those courses to practice or reinforce material. Finally, the committee asked for input on which outcomes should be assessed next year, and in which courses. We identified Outcome 3- Engage in Communication Inquiry to be assessed in COMM 303 Advanced Research Methods for the Fall 2016 semester..

On May 17th, the department hosted 2 norming workshops for COMM 220 and COMM 209. These courses are considered base courses in the major core, and are often taught by multiple instructors. In these workshops faculty who teach or will teach these courses identified a default textbook, and discussed the possibility of making these common textbooks for all sections in order to improve consistency. We also identified which of the programmatic outcomes would be explicitly addressed in these courses and at what level (I-P-R). Those outcomes will be added to all instructors' existing outcomes on the syllabi for those courses. The department also plans to run similar workshops for the other base courses, COMM 204 and COMM 211.

For next year, the committee/department will continue its direct assessment of outcomes. The goal is to assess a total of four more outcomes, which will put us on track to assess all 9 outcomes in a three year cycle. Additionally, we will submit the curriculum map and concerns about course sequencing and pre-req's to the curriculum committee for discussion and action. And, as previously stated, we will be developing a system for indirect measurement which we will also put into place next year.

Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University

Degree Program: BA in Communication Date: 8.12.16

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No Curriculum Map was provided.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes were identified. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. <input type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that span multiple learning domains. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). <input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were

				assessed in this cycle.
<p>2. Measures & Performance Goals</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome. <input type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct. <input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified. <input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course. <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided that demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what students know/can do.

				<input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.
3. Results	<input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected. <input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process. <input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	<input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected and analyzed. <input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. <input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	<input type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed. Will be <input type="checkbox"/> Results are provided. Will be <input type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful. <input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	<input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the assessment process. <input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well. <input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.
4. Engagement & Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. <input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or	<input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. <input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty. Will be <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement.	<input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important

	plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment. At this point, the discussions and improvements have focused on the assessment program.	stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 0 – Undeveloped	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 1 - Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 2 – Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 – Exemplary

COMMENTS

Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

Because the program does not yet have results from its assessment activities, its report does not address several items on the Student Learning Summary Report rubric. But it is clear that faculty members have invested a great deal of time and energy in revising the assessment program to clarify its outcomes, validate the curriculum map, identify assessment measures, and develop a manageable system for collecting artifacts with which to determine how well students are achieving the outcomes.

I would ask that in Part One, b, you identify exactly what the assignments you're assessing are. Because your program outcomes are so broad and include so many sub-outcomes, this is very important. I assume that the first measure, for example, is a recorded speech students delivered in response to a COMM 312 assignment requiring them to demonstrate the ability to apply some facet of ethical communication?? I note your comment that you did not ask instructors to tailor their assignments to the outcome, and I wonder if you will end up with artifacts that truly address them. We shall see! Provide the rubrics you use to determine students' skills/skill levels: They will help clarify the connection between the outcomes and the measures.

Rather than ask you to submit a revised version of this report once you have the data, I would ask that you add it to next year's report (which means you'll be reporting on a total of six outcomes). Be sure this report identifies what you learn from your assessment efforts, not just the numerical results but also what they mean. You'll need to know precisely what students know and can do well (and less well) in order to plan future improvements.

You're making progress. Thanks!