

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** Susan Kray (susan.kray@indstate.edu)

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary.

Part One

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?</p> <p>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) We developed a rubric in 2015-16 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. 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>Artifacts were collected at the end of the Spring 2016 semester and assessed by the 2016-17 assessment committee in Spring 2017.</p> <p>The results of the evaluation using the ratings are:</p> <p>Identify ethical perspectives: 2 Explain the relevance of various ethical perspectives: 3 Articulate the ethical dimensions of a communication situation: 4 Choose to communicate with ethical intentions: 4 Propose solutions for (un)ethical communication: 1 Evaluate the ethical elements of a communication situation: 4</p>	<p>1) The assessment committee in 2016-17 consisted of 3 members of the regular faculty, and was 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 in Fall 2017, and as a document posted on the department's Blackboard Site.</p>

<p>2. Learning Outcome 9 Influence Public Discourse</p>	<p>1) We developed a rubric in 2015-16 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.</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>Artifacts were collected at the end of the Spring 2016 semester and assessed by the 2016-17 assessment committee in Spring 2017.</p> <p>The results of the evaluation using the ratings are: Explain the importance of communication in civic life: 3</p> <p>Identify the challenges facing communities and the role of communication in resolving those challenges: 1</p> <p>Frame local, national and/or global issues from a Communication perspective: 3</p> <p>Evaluate local, national, and/or global issues from a Communication perspective: 3</p> <p>Utilize communication to respond to issues at the local, national and/or global level: 2</p> <p>Advocate a course of action to address local, national and/or global issues from a Communication perspective: 4</p> <p>Individuals to promote human rights, human dignity and human freedom: 2</p>	<p>1) The assessment committee in 2016-17 consisted of 3 members of the regular faculty, and was 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 in Fall 2017, and as a document posted on the department's Blackboard Site.</p>
--	---	---	---	---

Brief summary and preview: During the year 2016-2017, the Outcomes Analyses that will have been completed will include 3, 4, 7, and 9, with 7 and 9 completed in Spring 2017 and 3 and 4 remaining to be completed in Summer 2017. Thereupon, the remaining Outcomes needing analysis will be 1, 2, 5, 6, and 8.

Report: The 2015-2016 committee had researched assessment materials from the National Communication Association, and had recommended a set of nine learning outcomes for the communication discipline. The Department of Communication voted to approve these nine. The resulting chart identified 2 outcomes and corresponding courses from which the Committee collected material in spring 2016.

The course materials collected were for assessing **Outcome 7** (Apply Ethical Communication Principles and Practices) for the COMM 312 Persuasion course and for assessing **Outcome 9** (Influence Public Discourse) for the COMM 459, Communication Law, class. Both of these are core classes in the major. The 2015-2016 Committee turned the rubric and these course materials over to the 2016-2017 committee for assessment.

Dr. Susan Kray, Chair of the 2016-2017 Assessment Committee, together with Committee member Dr. Haijing Tu, used the rubric to assess in Spring 2017 the collected materials for **Outcomes 7 and 9**. In 2016-2017, the Assessment Committee also followed through on several key issues identified in Spring 2016 for the department's assessment plan, curriculum, and departmental processes. We are gathering materials for two outcomes to be analyzed this Summer, 2017. These outcomes will include **Outcome 3** (Engage in Communication Inquiry), using material from Comm 303, "Advanced Communication Research," and **Outcome 4** (Create Messages Appropriate to the Audience, Purpose, and Context) using material from Comm 312 (Persuasion Theories).

We are also gathering Spring 2017 materials for Comm 459 for **Outcome 1** (Describe the Communication Discipline and Its Central Questions), and **Outcome 8** (Utilize Communication to Embrace Difference), to be analyzed in Fall 2017. Rubrics will need to be created. Remaining to be assessed by collecting data in Fall 2017 to evaluate in Spring 2018 will be materials from Comm 459 for **Outcome 5** (Critically Analyze Messages) and **Outcome 6** (Demonstrate Ability to Accomplish Communication Goals - Self-Efficacy). The Committee together with the Department will need to create rubrics, decide on courses to analyze, and collect materials to be analyzed in Spring 2018. We presently have no core course in the Curricular Map which reinforces Outcome 2; thus we also need, as a Department, to consider modification to the "Student Learning Outcomes Program Assessment Curriculum Map."

For next year, 2017-2018, the Assessment Committee will act in consultation with the Department in order to continue in its direct assessment of outcomes. With two outcomes completed in Spring 2017, the goal now is to assess two outcomes in Summer 2017, two in Fall 2017, and the remaining three in Spring 2018. Thus the Department will have fulfilled the concept of the previous committee by addressing all nine outcomes in a three-year cycle.

Conclusion: The additional challenge in 2017-2018 is to incorporate larger, more representative amounts of relevant data and produce progressively more useful analyses by having a increasing proportion of the faculty participate in creating and modifying rubrics, collecting student materials, and analyzing outcomes. For our analysis, we used student materials collected by the 2015-2016 Assessment Committee. Based on the somewhat mixed outcomes as reported above, we suggest that it may be appropriate to suggest that these courses may need in future, to focus on reading/viewing, discussions, and exercises aimed at more limited lists of desired outcomes. The reason is that these courses may be seen to be doing a very good job when their results are measured against a reasonably small list of goals within each Learning Outcome. This issue would be an appropriate topic for Department discussions during the coming year or two. We may also find that it makes sense to consider abbreviating our list of desired learning outcomes. The focus has been on direct measures, but discussion of appropriate indirect measures will be needed next year.

Addendum by Interim Chair and Interim Graduate Program Director (Dr. Debra Israel, debra.israel@indstate.edu)

The graduate program began steps to undertake formal assessment this year, but did not complete the rubrics in time to share for this report. The graduate faculty has been discussing major changes in the program and the assessment done in the coming year, and over the summer, will contribute to these larger plans. The committee report for the undergraduate assessment process is above. As the department moves ahead with assessment, the plan is to better incorporate all faculty members into the process, and to have an active training session to learn about the process. The challenge of assessing outcomes using the core courses at the point of reinforcing concepts will also be addressed as Comm 459 is currently relied on for many of the outcomes, and another course may be more appropriate.

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

Degree Program: BA in Communication Date: 01.12.18

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

				<p>extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.</p>
<p>2. Measures & Performance Goals</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were provided.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were employed, and most are direct.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)</p> <p><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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one</p>

				<p>outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate that this is appropriate.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were summarized as well as provided to demonstrate that the measure provides specific evidence of what students know/can do.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>
<p>3. Results</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance</p>	<p><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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards</p>

		standards expected of them.	standards expected of them.	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 plans.	<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 type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	<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 goals and implement plans to adjust activities, expectations, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important 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 type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 0 – Undeveloped	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 1 - Developing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 2 – Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 – Exemplary

The two outcomes assessed are clear and measurable, and the report offers detailed explanation as to how the two measures are assessed. What it does not tell me is *what* is being assessed. What were the assignments students were expected to complete? Performance standards are appropriate, though I am curious as to how you ensure that random sampling (which is fine, especially in a big program) is providing you with representative results. Results are mixed, as you note, but the good news is, *you have results!!* Multiple faculty are engaged in assessing learning, and while conversations about results and plans for improvement may not yet be regular, the program is moving in that direction, and will continue to improve its assessment program.

Thank you for sharing your 2017 Student Learning Summary Report!