

# Assessment Report - Comprehensive Review

## Program Assessment

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| <b>Department:</b>     | Communication                                   |
| <b>Program:</b>        | Communication ADT and Communication Certificate |
| <b>Submitter:</b>      | Helen Acosta                                    |
| <b>Date Submitted:</b> | 9/18/2017                                       |

### A. List your Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)/Administrative Unit Outcomes (AUOs)

1. Construct, use, and interpret messages across multiple channels to inform, persuade, manage,
- 2 Identify and value disparate systems of social norms and values that influence the human
- 3 Understand the various theoretical and pragmatic skills that enable them to navigate social
- 4 Become familiar with both field-specific nomenclature as well as effective oral, listening, and

### B. How did your outcomes assessment results during the past three years inform your program planning? Use the bullet points below to organize your response.

Our biggest changes came in 2015-2016 when we overhauled several of our workbooks to better enforce SLO skills:

SLO 1: form and present informative persuasive messages

57% of students assessed in oral communication courses in 2015-2016 met this skillset (though, when the skillset was broken into 6 separate skills, skill development ranged between 54-63%)

Our students skill development was far greater when it came to organizing their speeches. The area where their skill development suffered was source citation. In our work for all three courses that meet the oral communication requirement we added new exercises to further SLO 2 skills. In COMM B1 we completely overhauled the workbook so that it now includes 21 activities to help develop SLO 2 skills, 5 of which are specifically oral citation exercises. In COMM B4 the instructors are piloting different activities to develop best practices. In COMM B8 we added several new activities related to SLO 2 to the workbook.

SLO 3: present oral messages to appropriate audiences and adhere to conventions of message delivery

63% of students assessed in oral communication courses in 2015-2016 met this skillset (though, when the skillset was broken into 4 separate skills, skill development ranged between 57-73%)

Our students skill development was far greater when it came to verbal and nonverbal delivery choices. The area where their skill development suffered was use of presentation aids. In our work for all three courses we've added new exercises to further SLO 4 skills. In COMM B1 we completely overhauled the workbook so that it now includes 17 activities to help develop SLO 4 skills, 8 of which are specifically presentation aid exercises. In COMM B4 the instructors are piloting different activities to develop best practices. In COMM B8 we added several new activities related to SLO 4 to the workbook, including presentation aid activities.

SLO 4: manage personal communication apprehension and anxiety

84% of students assessed in oral communication courses in 2015-2016 met this skillset (the skillset was not broken into separate skills).

For this SLO we looked at the skillset based on the appearance of speaker confidence and comfort in the video. While we have used the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension in the past in order to evaluate this SLO we found that video evaluation by faculty was more accurate than student

**C. Describe how the program monitors and evaluates its effectiveness.**

At the program level we track student completion of certificates and degrees. In the last 3 years our annual completion of degrees has climbed steadily from 47 degrees completed to 66 to 70. In terms of Certificate completion, we saw a huge jump in 2015-16 with 193 certificates completed. We attribute this jump to holding both Spring and Fall communication orientations in all of our courses. Last year, we did not hold live orientations and our rates of certificate attainment fell dramatically. This year we plan to return to our 2015-16 methods. At the course level, we complete our course assessments in accordance with our 6 year plan. For the single class where we have a better authentic assessment instrument, COMM B6: Intercultural Communication, we have been able to embed assessment of all SLOs each semester. We have found that this speeds our progress of improvement and enhances the quality of our collegial discussion for COMM B6. We continue to search for and develop better instruments for our other courses.

**D. Describe how the program engages all unit members in the self-evaluation dialog and process.**

Every instructor is asked to complete the assessment developed by several faculty who teach the class. These assessments happen in each of their classes in the Spring semester when the SLO is being assessed. At our May retreat, lead faculty share the results of the assessment with the other program leads and discuss ways to bring the faculty who teach the course together for discussion of the results. In the Fall, lead faculty bring all of the instructors together who teach the course for a discussion of the results of the assessment. This discussion includes methods of improving the assessment instrument as well as methods of improving the student attainment of the skill/s assessed. Each year the department chair reminds all faculty that SLO narratives are part of their evaluation packet and discusses ways that faculty could use the results of departmental course assessments as part of their SLO narratives.

**E. Provide recent data on the measurement of the PLOs/AUOs, as well as a brief summary of findings.**

No data. We are still working to change our PLOs to reflect our current program.

**F. How do you engage in collegial dialog about student learning outcomes?**

In the Fall, lead faculty bring all of the instructors together who teach the course for a discussion of the results of the assessment. This discussion includes methods of improving the assessment

instrument as well as methods of improving the student attainment of the skill/s assessed.

**Institutional Learning Outcomes:**

Think: Think critically and evaluate sources and information for validity and usefulness.

Communicate: Communicate effectively in both written and oral forms.

Demonstrate: Demonstrate competency in a field of knowledge or with job-related skills.

Engage: Engage productively in all levels of society – interpersonal, community, the state and the nation, and the world.

**G. What have the program's PLOs/AUOs revealed or confirmed in the past three years?**

That the ILOs are more well-suited to our program than the PLOs. As a result, we have been attempting to change our PLOs. Elumen implementation has slowed this process.

**H. If applicable, list other information, data feedback or metrics to assess the program's effectiveness (e.g., surveys, job placement, transfer rates, output measurements).**

n/a

**I. a. How do course level student learning outcomes align with program learning outcomes? Instructional programs can combine questions I and J for one response (SLO/PLO/ILO). b. How do the program learning outcomes align with Institutional Learning Outcomes?**

Over a decade ago, the 6 full-time faculty of the Communication program attended a workshop on campus where we crafted our Program Learning Outcomes to reflect our course offerings at that time. When we crafted these Outcomes we were still primarily a general education program, without a full major of our own. When we were asked in 2015 to map our classes to our PLOs as well as the ILOs we realized that our PLOs no longer reflected our course offerings or the real goals of the program. We talked about the problem for over a year and found that the refrains of "If only our PLOs were more like the ILOs!" and, "It is as though the ILOs were written for our program!" were both often repeated. So, on Saturday, December 3, 2016 9 full-time Communication faculty met with the goal of mapping our courses to the ILOs then building new PLOs that mapped through both and reflected the current goals and offerings of our program. Since that time, eLumen implementation has blocked out ability to switch to our new PLOs...as a result, our old PLOs are listed under A. These old PLOs are only appropriate for assessment of our Oral Communication courses.

**J. Include the activities your program is planning to close the achievement gaps during the next three years and the impact you expect from them.**

We only have data on achievement gaps for COMM B6, Intercultural Communication. The one area where students consistently fail to measure up to the international standard set in the Kozai Intercultural Effectiveness Scale is "Positive Regard". While we have struggled with improving student success on this outcome, we have worked together consistently, completed background research, tried a number of different methods and we are beginning to see results: For the past 3 semesters each semester a slightly higher percentage of students meets the "positive regard" skill. For our other courses, we are working to find appropriate instruments that will allow



