

2013-2014 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Part 1: Background Information

B1. Program name: [Communication Studies/Journalism/Digital Video (See also Film Studies Assessment Report)]

B2. Report author(s): [Molly Dugan]

B3. Fall 2012 enrollment: []

Use the *Department Fact Book 2013* by OIR (Office of Institutional Research) to get the fall 2012 enrollment: (<http://www.csus.edu/oir/Data%20Center/Department%20Fact%20Book/Departmental%20Fact%20Book.html>).

B4. Program type: [SELECT ONLY ONE]

X	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
	2. Credential
	3. Master's degree
	4. Doctorate: Ph.D./E.D.D.
	5. Other, specify:

Part 2: Six Questions for the 2013-2014 Annual Assessment

Question 1 (Q1): Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) Assessed in 2013-2014.

Q1.1. Which of the following program learning outcomes (PLOs) or Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals did you assess **in 2013-2014**? (See 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report Guidelines for more details). [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

X	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) *
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
X	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
X	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
X	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
X	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
X	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
X	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
X	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above: a. b. c.

* One of the WASC's new requirements is that colleges and universities report on the level of student performance **at graduation** in five core areas: **critical thinking, information literacy, written communication, oral communication, and quantitative literacy.**

Q1.1.1. Please provide more detailed information about the PLO(s) you checked above:

The three major learning outcomes are the same across all Department programs, and align with the University's Baccalaureate Learning Goals in the areas of Competence in the Discipline, Intellectual and Practical Skills, Personal and Social Responsibility and Integrative Learning. The methods with which we attain these goals, however, vary by area of study. The learning outcomes are as follows:

1. Students will communicate effectively in a variety of contexts.
2. Students will think critically when constructing and consuming messages.
3. Students will have knowledge of program principles.

Q1.2. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q1.3. Is your program externally accredited (except for WASC)?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q1.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q1.4)

Q1.3.1. If yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q1.4. Have you used the *Degree Qualification Profile (DQP)** to develop your PLO(s)?

	1. Yes
	2. No, but I know what DQP is.
X	3. No. I don't know what DQP is.
	4. Don't know

* **Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP)** – a framework funded by the Lumina Foundation that describes the kinds of learning and levels of performance that may be expected of students who have earned an associate, baccalaureate, or master's degree. Please see the links for more details:

http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The_Degree_Qualifications_Profile.pdf and
<http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/DQPNew.html>.

Question 2 (Q2): Standards of Performance/Expectations for EACH PLO.

Q2.1. Has the program developed/adopted **EXPLICIT** standards of performance/expectations for the PLO(s) you assessed in **2013-2014 Academic Year**? (For example: We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 on the Written Communication VALUE rubric.)

	1. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for ALL PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
X	2. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for SOME PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	3. No (If no, go to Q2.2)
	4. Don't know (Go to Q2.2)
	5. Not Applicable (Go to Q2.2)

Q2.1.1. If yes, what are the desired levels of learning, including the criteria and standards of performance/expectations, especially at or near graduation, for **EACH PLO** assessed in 2013-2014 Academic Year? (For example: what will tell you if students have achieved your expected level of performance for the learning outcome.) **Please provide the rubric and/or the expectations that you have developed for EACH PLO one at a time below.** [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

We expect students to have scores of at least 3.0 in all areas of the AAC&U's VALUES Written Communication and Oral Communication at the time of graduation. Other PLO(s) were tested prior to the capstone classes.

Q2.2. Have you published the **PLO(s)/expectations/rubric(s)** you assessed in 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q3.1)

Q2.2.1. If yes, where were the **PLOs/expectations/rubrics** published? [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

X	1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce/develop/master the PLO(s)
	2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce /develop/master the PLO(s)
	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
	4. In the university catalogue
	5. On the academic unit website or in the newsletters
X	6. In the assessment or program review reports/plans/resources/activities
	7. In the new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
	10. In other places, specify:

Question 3 (Q3): Data, Results, and Conclusions for EACH PLO

Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

Q3.2. If yes, was the data **scored/evaluated** for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

Q3.3. If yes, what **DATA** have you collected? What are the **results, findings, and CONCLUSION(s)** for EACH PLO assessed in 2013-2014? In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations? In what areas do students need improvement? Please provide a simple and clear summary of the key data and findings, including **tables and graphs** if applicable for EACH PLO one at a time. [WORD LIMIT: 600 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

See attachment: Findings

Q3.4. Do students meet the expectations/standards of performance as determined by the program and achieved the learning outcomes? [PLEASE MAKE SURE THE PLO YOU SPECIFY HERE IS THE SAME ONE YOU CHECKED/SPECIFIED IN Q1.1].

See attachment: Findings

Q3.4.1. First PLO: [See attachment: Findings]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

[NOTE: IF YOU HAVE MORE THAN ONE PLO, YOU NEED TO REPEAT THE TABLE IN Q3.4.1 UNTIL YOU INCLUDE ALL THE PLO(S) YOU ASSESSED IN 2013-2014.]

Q3.4.2. Second PLO: [See attachment: Findings]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Question 4 (Q4): Evaluation of Data Quality: Reliability and Validity.

Q4.1. How many PLOs in total did your program assess in the 2013-2014 academic year?

4 in Communication Studies; 3 in Journalism; 5 in Digital Video/Film

Q4.2. Please choose **ONE ASSESSED PLO** as an example to illustrate how you use direct, indirect, and/or other methods/measures to collect data. If you only assessed one PLO in **2013-14**, YOU CAN SKIP this question. If you assessed MORE THAN ONE PLO, please check **ONLY ONE PLO BELOW EVEN IF YOU ASSESSED MORE THAN ONE PLO IN 2013-2014.**

See attachment: Findings

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) ¹
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global

	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Other PLO. Specify:

Direct Measures

Q4.3. Were direct measures used to assess this PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q4.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.4)

Q4.3.1. Which of the following DIRECT measures were used? [**Check all that apply**]

X	1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
X	2. Key assignments from other CORE classes
	3. Key assignments from other classes
X	4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques
	5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects
	6. E-Portfolios
	7. Other portfolios
	8. Other measure. Specify:

Q4.3.2. Please provide the direct measure(s) [**key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)**] that you used to collect the data. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

See attachment: Findings

Q4.3.2.1. Was the direct measure(s) [**key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)**] aligned directly with the rubric/criterion?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.3. Was the direct measure (s) [**key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)**] aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No

	3. Don't know
--	---------------

Q4.3.4. How was the evidence scored/evaluated? [Select one only]

	1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (If checked, go to Q4.3.7)
	2. Use rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class
	3. Use rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
	4. Use rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
X	5. Use other means. Specify: AAC&U VALUES rubrics + multiple-choice exams + rubrics pilot-tested and modified by a group of faculty

Q4.3.5. What rubric/criterion was adopted to score/evaluate the above key assignments/projects/portfolio? [Select one only]

	1. The VALUE rubric(s)
	2. Modified VALUE rubric(s)
	3. A rubric that is totally developed by local faculty
X	4. Use other means. Specify: All of the above

Q4.3.6. Was the rubric/criterion aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.7. Were the evaluators (e.g., faculty or advising board members) who reviewed student work calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.8. Were there checks for inter-rater reliability?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.9. Were the sample sizes for the direct measure adequate?

	1. Yes
X	2. No – We used larger sample sizes than previous years, but we could continue to expand, given the size of our programs.
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.10. How did you select the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc)? Please briefly specify here: We used random samples of student papers/speeches with all names redacted. For exams, we selected random sections of the appropriate class to give the tests.

Indirect Measures

Q4.4. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q4.5)

Q4.4.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used?

	1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE, etc.)
	2. University conducted student surveys (OIR surveys)
	3. College/Department/program conducted student surveys
	4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	7. Others, specify:

Q4.4.2. If surveys were used, were the sample sizes adequate?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.4.3. If surveys were used, please briefly specify how you select your sample? What is the response rate?

Other Measures

Q4.5. Were external benchmarking data used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q4.6)

Q4.5.1. Which of the following measures was used?

	1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
	2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc)
	3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc)
	4. Others, specify:

Q4.6. Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (Go to Q4.7)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.7)

Q4.6.1. If yes, please specify: AAC&U VALUES rubrics, modified rubrics and comprehensive exams.

Alignment and Quality

Q4.7. Please describe how you collected the data? For example, in what course(s) (or by what means) were data collected? How reliable and valid is the data? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

See attachment: Findings

Q4.8. How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO? 11 total for all programs

NOTE: IF IT IS ONLY ONE, GO TO Q5.1.

Q4.8.1. Did the data (including all the assignments/projects/portfolios) from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.8.2. Were **ALL** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Question 5 (Q5): Use of Assessment Data.

Q5.1. To what extent have the assessment results **from 2012-2013** been used for? [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

	Very Much (1)	Quite a Bit (2)	Some (3)	Not at all (4)	Not Applicable (9)
1. Improving specific courses			X		
2. Modifying curriculum	X				
3. Improving advising and mentoring	X				
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals	X				
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations	X				
6. Developing/updating assessment plan	X				
7. Annual assessment reports	X				
8. Program review	X				
9. Prospective student and family information				X	
10. Alumni communication				X	
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)					X
12. Program accreditation					X
13. External accountability reporting requirement					X
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					X
15. Strategic planning		X			
16. Institutional benchmarking					X
17. Academic policy development or modification				X	
18. Institutional Improvement					X

19. Resource allocation and budgeting			X		
20. New faculty hiring				X	
21. Professional development for faculty and staff					
22. Other Specify:					

Q5.1.1. Please provide one or two best examples to show how you have used the assessment data above.

See attachment: Overview/ Summary of Changes for 2013-2014

Q5.2. As a result of the **assessment effort in 2013-2014** and based on the prior feedbacks from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of program learning outcomes)?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q5.3)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q5.3)

Q5.2.1. What changes are anticipated? By what mechanism will the changes be implemented? How and when will you assess the impact of proposed modifications? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

See attachment: Overview/Summary of Changes for 2013-2014

Q5.2.2. Is there a follow-up assessment on these areas that need improvement?

	1. Yes
X	2. No, but we expect to focus assessment in those areas next year.
	3. Don't know

Q5.3. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to program learning outcomes (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected assessment data in this way, please briefly report your results here. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

None

Question 6 (Q6). Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year?

X	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) ¹
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
X	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
X	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
X	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
X	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
X	9. Team work

	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
X	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
X	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that the program is going to assess but not included above: a. b. c.

Part 3: Additional Information

A1. In which academic year did you **develop** the current assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
X	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet developed a formal assessment plan

A2. In which academic year did you last **update** your assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
X	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet updated the assessment plan

A3. Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A4. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment **of student learning** occurs in the curriculum?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5. Does the program have any capstone class?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5.1. If yes, please list the course number for each capstone class: [Jour. 135, Coms 180, 181, 182, 183, 185, 187, 188, 189, 192]

A6. Does the program have **ANY** capstone project?

X	1. Yes
	2. No

	3. Don't know
--	---------------

A7. Name of the academic unit: [_Communication Studies, Journalism, Digital Video/Film__ ____]

A8. Department in which the academic unit is located: [_Communication Studies__ ____]

A9. Department Chair's Name: [_Steven Buss____]

A10. Total number of annual assessment reports submitted by your academic unit for 2013-2014: [_1__]

A11. College in which the academic unit is located:

X	1. Arts and Letters
	2. Business Administration
	3. Education
	4. Engineering and Computer Science
	5. Health and Human Services
	6. Natural Science and Mathematics
	7. Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
	8. Continuing Education (CCE)
	9. Other, specify:

Undergraduate Degree Program(s):

A12. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: [__ __]

A12.1. List all the name(s): [_____]

A12.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? [__ __]

Master Degree Program(s):

A13. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: [__ __]

A13.1. List all the name(s): [_____]

A13.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? [_____]

Credential Program(s):

A14. Number of credential degree programs the academic unit has: [__0__]

A14.1. List all the names: [_____]

Doctorate Program(s)

A15. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: [__0__]

A15.1. List the name(s): [_____]

A16. Would this assessment report apply to other program(s) and/or diploma concentration(s) in your academic unit*?

	1. Yes
	2. No

*If the assessment conducted for this program (including the PLO(s), the criteria and standards of performance/expectations you established, the data you collected and analyzed, the conclusions of the assessment) is the same as the assessment conducted for other programs within the academic unit, you only need to submit one assessment report.

16.1. If yes, please specify the name of each program: _____
16.2. If yes, please specify the name of each diploma concentration: _____

Attachment for Annual Assessment Report, 2013-2014

Department of Communication Studies

June 30, 2014

Prepared by Molly Dugan

Overview/Summary of Changes

The Communication Studies assessment measures are based on quantitative methods and validated rubrics – including those from AAC&U's VALUES Written Communication, Oral Communication, Inquiry and Analysis, Critical Thinking and Teamwork rubrics. The Department assessed student papers, oral presentations, video projects and exams.

The assessment plan divides the Department into three sub-categories: Communication Studies (and Public Relations), Journalism and Digital Video/Film Studies. While there is overlap between these areas, the Department conducted assessment for multiple PLOs in each one.

The Department used assessment data from 2013-2014 to make the following changes.

STEVE – PLEASE CHECK WORDING HERE AND ADD A COPY OF THE NEW ADVISING FORMS PLS ADD ANY CHANGES OR ANTICIPATED CHANGES THAT I MISSED.

1. Curriculum – The Department approved a major curriculum overhaul this year in Communication Studies. Instead of choosing a concentration, students now will select a pair of classes – one theory and one capstone – for their emphasis after completing the core requirements. (See attachment: advising forms.) First, this change will decrease time to graduation, as students will have fewer specific pre-requisites to complete before beginning their capstone class. Second, it will allow students to take advantage of a variety of course offerings. Third, it will move students through the core requirements earlier in their academic career, which means that the Department will be better able to track their progress through assessment.
2. Hiring – The previous assessment report demonstrated several problems with our part-time hiring practices. We discovered through analyzing assessment data that some part-time faculty were not covering the required material. This year, the Department combined part-time evaluation and part-time hiring into the same committee. This change means that the committee will be more informed when ranking part-time faculty and will result in more qualified lecturers in the classroom. Second, the Department has created a part-time adhoc committee to provide more mentoring and guidance for part-time faculty, which again, will result in better teaching practices.

The Department will use assessment data from 2013-2014 to consider the following changes.

1. Hiring – The Department expects to hire additional full-time faculty in the coming year, and the assessment data will be useful in determining what areas the Department needs to focus in order to meet our PLO(s.)
2. Curriculum – The assessment data will be crucial in determining the effectiveness of our new curriculum organization. We expect to make modifications as we launch the new curriculum this fall. (See curriculum map.)

3. See Findings. The Department will continue to modify its assessment measures (noted in that section of this report) as we prepare to collect data for 2014-2015.

Findings

Communication Studies

1. Students will communicate effectively in a variety of contexts.
 - a. *Demonstrate proficiency in oral communication*: determine presentation needs in different situations; correctly use visual aids; make appropriate language choices; use proper structure; and effectively deliver presentations.

The department sampled 20 speeches from 2 capstone classes – Coms 183, Senior Seminar in Media Issues and Coms 187, Issue Management and Case Studies in Public Relations – and 1 senior-level class, Persuasive Public Speaking. Faculty used the AAC&U's VALUES Oral Communication rubric to score the selected presentations. The rubric is comprised of 5 dimensions: language, delivery, supporting material and central message. They are scored on a 5-point scale that ranges from a value of "0," indicating that it does not meet the benchmark to "4," indicating complete proficiency. The Department's Assessment Committee Chair worked with faculty to ensure they applied the criteria in the same way. The following is a table of the average scores for each area.

Oral Communication

Organization	3.0
Language	2.9
Delivery	2.9
Supporting material	2.8
Central Message	2.9

The average scores show that the average scores are well above the benchmark and within 1 to 1.2 points of complete proficiency. We noted an increase of three-tenths of a point over last year in the area of delivery. The remaining categories were slightly lower than last year.

We expect that at the time of graduation, the average scores would be at least 3.0 in all categories. In the area of Organization, the average score was 3.0. The average scores show a lag of only one-tenth of a point in three areas and two-tenths of a point in one area, which indicate that the Department is very close to meeting its goal.

- b. *Demonstrate proficiency in written communication*: implement a variety of style sheets; use thesis statements; use appropriate organizational strategies; apply transitions; include appropriate evidentiary support; and employ grammar conventions.

The Department sampled 18 papers from capstone classes – Coms 183, Senior Seminar in Media Issues; Coms 167, Systems and Theories of Rhetoric; and Coms 187, Issue Management and Case Studies in Public Relations. Faculty used the AAC&U’s VALUES Written Communication rubric to score the selected papers. The rubric is comprised of 5 dimensions: context and purpose, content development, genre and disciplinary conventions, sources and evidence and control of syntax and mechanics. They are scored on a 5-point scale that ranges from a value of “0,” indicating that it does not meet the benchmark to “4,” indicating complete proficiency. The Department’s Assessment Committee Chair worked with faculty to ensure they applied the criteria in the same way. The following is a table of the average scores for each area.

Written Communication

Context & purpose	3.2
Content development	2.9
Genre & disciplinary conventions	3.1
Sources & evidence	3.2
Control of syntax & mechanics	2.7

The average scores show that the average scores are well above the benchmark with 3 of 5 areas scoring within 1 point of complete proficiency. We noted significant improvement over last year in four of the five the areas, including content development (three-tenths of a point), genre and disciplinary conventions (nine-tenths of a point), sources and evidence (six-tenths of a point) and control of syntax and mechanics (seven-tenths of a point.)

The Department expects that at the time of graduation, the average scores would be at least 3.0 in all categories. The average scores demonstrate that 3 of 5 categories met this goal. Content development is within one-tenth of a point and control of syntax and mechanics is within three-tenth of a point, which indicate that the Department is moving towards its goal.

2. Students will think critically when constructing and consuming messages.
 - a. *Demonstrate proficiency in critical analysis research:* identify key critical perspectives of thought; be able to frame a question; appropriately select an artifact; and select appropriate methods to answer a question.

The Department sampled 10 student papers in a required upper-division writing class, Coms 100B, Critical Analysis of Messages. Faculty used the AAC&U’s VALUES Inquiry and Analysis rubric to score the selected papers. The rubric is comprised of 6 dimensions: topic selection, existing knowledge, research and/or views, design process, analysis, conclusions and limitations and implications. They are scored on a 5-point scale that ranges from a value of “0,” indicating that

it does not meet the benchmark to “4,” indicating complete proficiency. The Department’s Assessment Committee Chair worked with faculty to ensure they applied the criteria in the same way. The following is a table of the average scores for each area.

Inquiry & Analysis

Topic selection	3.1
Existing knowledge, research and/or views	2.8
Design process	2.9
Analysis	3.1
Conclusions	3.2
Limitations & implications	2.8

The results show that students perform well above the benchmark in all areas. Half of the categories scored within 1 point of complete proficiency. We noted a significant improvement over last year in the areas of conclusions and limitations and implications, an increase of four-tenths of a point and half a point, respectively.

- b. *Demonstrate a proficiency in quantitative research:* identify principles of research design; understand operational and conceptual definitions; select the correct statistical approach to answer hypotheses; and have knowledge of internal validity threats.

See pilot data – 2011-2012 (IPP)

3. Students will have knowledge of program principles.

Communication Studies: For this learning objective, the department administered a 20-question multiple-choice exam that was constructed, vetted and approved by the faculty. 208 students in Coms 100A, Survey of Communication Studies, completed the exam. To meet the benchmark, students must earn a score of at least 70 percent.

The average score on the exam was 66 percent, which does not meet the benchmark. Last year’s score was 71 percent, but the exam was given to less than half as many students, which may account for some of the decrease.

First, many of the exams were given in classes taught by part-time faculty who did not weigh in on the development of this assessment measure. In some cases, the part-time faculty did not cover the material on which the exam was based before students took it.

Second, this class is the first in Communication Studies for many students, and functions as an introduction to the field of study. Many students take this class to determine whether or not they pursue this major. Thus, the faculty found that this class is not suitable for this assessment measure, and we plan to review our curriculum map in September to determine a more appropriate placement.

Public Relations: The Department administered a 20-question multiple choice exam that was constructed, vetted and approved by the faculty. 56 students in Coms 118, Introduction to Public Relations, completed the exam. 59 students in the Public Relations capstone class, Coms 187, Issue Management and Case Studies in Public Relations, also took the exam. The results are attached at the end of this document. The average scores for the capstone class exceed the 70 percent benchmark.

Journalism

1. Students will communicate effectively in a variety of contexts.
 - a. *Demonstrate a mastery of journalistic style writing for a variety of audiences and media:* use clear and concise language; adhere to Associated Press style; show proficiency in using written English, including proper spelling, grammar and punctuation; and construct stories in an organized, logical way.

See 2012-2013 Assessment Report. The Department sampled student papers from the Journalism capstone class, Jour. 135, Public Affairs Reporting. Faculty used the AAC&U Written Communication rubric to score the selected papers. The rubric is comprised of 5 dimensions: context and purpose, content development, genre and disciplinary conventions, sources and evidence and control of syntax and mechanics. They are scored on a 5-point scale that ranges from a value of “0,” indicating that it does not meet the benchmark to “4,” indicating complete proficiency.

The results showed that in all five areas, students were within 1 point of complete proficiency, exceeding the goal of 3.0 at the time of graduation in all categories. In the areas of sources and evidence and control of syntax and mechanics, the average scores were four-tenths of a point from complete proficiency. Due to the high average scores, the Department decided to focus its assessment resources this year on evaluating the two other PLO(s).

2. Students will think critically when constructing and consuming messages.
 - a. Demonstrate higher-level thinking through ethical decision-making, story development and writing; evaluate information and judge its veracity; use appropriate research methods, including interviews, public records and quantitative data to produce publishable content.

The Department sampled 10 papers from an ongoing class project in an upper-division course, Jour. 130, News Reporting and Writing I and II. Faculty constructed, vetted and approved a rubric – based on recommendations from the Poynter Institute, the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass

Communication and the Society of Professional Journalists – to score the selected papers. The rubric is comprised of 5 dimensions, including accuracy, thoroughness, balance, story development and research quality. (See rubric.) They are scored on a 5-point scale that ranges from a value of “0,” indicating that it does not meet the benchmark to “4,” indicating complete proficiency. Journalism faculty worked together to evaluate the student papers to ensure consistency and reliability. The following is a table of the average scores for each area.

Critical Thinking

Accuracy	3.4
Thoroughness	2.9
Balance	3.7
Story Development	3.1
Research Quality	3.0

3. Students will have knowledge of Journalism principles.
 - a. *Demonstrate ethical decision-making*; apply ethical principles as practiced by professional journalists in research, interviewing, writing and audio-visuals; recognize the ethical responsibility to the public and profession; use the Society of Professional Journalists’ Code of Ethics.
 - b. *Demonstrate knowledge of media laws*; understand laws that govern journalists’ rights and responsibilities, freedom of speech, libel and slander, public records and open meetings.

For this learning objective, the department administered a 19-question multiple-choice exam on Journalism ethics and law that was constructed, vetted and approved by the faculty. (After analyzing the results, the Journalism faculty dropped 1 question, as it had more than one potential correct response.) The average score 73 percent, 3 percentage points above the benchmark.

The goal at the time of graduation is a score of at least 80 percent. In the area of ethics, students met or exceeded this score. In the area of law, however, students did not meet the benchmark.

To improve assessment, the Journalism faculty is planning to redesign the exam, and create two separate exams – one focused on ethics and one on law – for this PLO. That will assist us better determine what areas need more focus.

Table 1: The Curriculum Map of Required Core Classes for Communication Studies

Required Classes	PLO 1	PLO 2	PLO 3
Coms 2	I, D	I	I
Coms 8	I,D	I	I
Coms 55	I,D	I	I
Coms 100A	I,D	I, D	I,D
Coms 100B	D,M	D	D
Coms 100C	D	D	D
Theory	D	D	D,M
Research Methods	D, M	M	D, M
Capstone	M	M	M

Table 2: The Curriculum Map of Required Core Classes for Journalism

Required Classes	PLO 1	PLO 2	PLO 3
Jour. 20	I,D	I, D	I, D
Jour. 30	I, D	I, D	I,D
Jour 50/55	I, D	I, D	I,D
Jour. 128	D, M	D, M	D, M
Jour. 130A	D, M	D, M	D, M
Jour. 130B	D, M	D, M	D, M
Jour. 153	D, M	D, M	M
Jour. 135	M	M	M
Jour. 197	M	M	M

“I” stands for “Introduced

“D” stands for “Developed”

“M” stands for “Mastered”

Table 2: Film Studies Program Learning Outcomes, Rubrics and Standards

PLOs	Measurement Tools and/or Rubrics	Standards and Assessment Examples
<p>PLO I: Competence in the discipline knowledge Film studies students are expected to demonstrate knowledge of discipline principles in the following eight areas</p> <p>Area 1- Camera Technology, Area 2 -Editing Theory, Area 3 -Camera Lenses, Area 4 -Video Signals, Area 5 - Audio Processing (EQ, Compressors, etc.), Area 6-Time-Code, Area 7-Script formatting, Area 8-Lighting basics</p>	Faculty vetted and approved exam based on the eight discipline knowledge areas	<p>To reach the benchmark students must make a 70% or higher on the exam. Individual questions can be disaggregated to determine whether there is discipline knowledge benchmark in each of the five areas is being met.</p> <p>See Appendix for results.</p>
<p>PLO 2: Video Communication Film studies students demonstrate a mastery of video communication:</p> <p>Area 1-Develop clear video concepts, Area 2- implement effective organizational strategies, Area 3-Use video technique effectively including; sound, cinematography and editing Area 4- use appropriate cinematic conventions to convey meaning</p>	Video Communication Rubric developed by program faculty.	<p>Senior projects will be scored using a faculty-vetted rubric. In each area, to reach the benchmark, students must score 3 or higher.</p> <p>See Appendix for results</p>
<p>PLO 3: Written Communication Film studies students demonstrate proficiency in written communication</p> <p>Area 1-Using clear language to show context and purpose Area 2- Show proficiency in using written English, genre and disciplinary conventions Area 3-Use proper evidentiary material Area 4- Control syntax and mechanics including proper spelling, grammar and punctuation.</p>	Capstone Paper scored with Written Communication VALUE Rubric developed by AAC&U (Appendix III)	12 randomly sampled Papers from Coms 192, Senior Seminar in Film and English 105, Film Theory and Criticism, will be assessed using the rubric. 70% of students must score 3 or higher for the program to reach the benchmark in each of the four areas.
<p>PLO 4: Team Work Demonstrate ability to work collaboratively in small groups Area 1- Contribution to Team meetings Area 2-Individual Contributions Area 3-Fosters Constructive Team Climate Area 4-Responds to Conflict</p>	Capstone Senior Project group survey based on Teamwork Value Rubric: (Appendix IV)	All students will be given a peer evaluation survey that is based on the 4 areas of the teamwork rubric. 70% of students must score 3 or higher for the program to reach the benchmark in each of the four areas.
<p>PLO 5: Critical Thinking Students will think critically when consuming and constructing images</p> <p>Area 1-Explanation of Issues Area 2-Evidence Area 3-Influence of context and assumptions Area 4- Students position Area 5-Conclusions and related outcomes</p>	Capstone paper scored with the Critical Thinking Value Rubric	12 randomly sampled Papers from Coms 192, Senior Seminar in Film and English 105, Film Theory and Criticism, will be assessed using the rubric. 70% of students must score 3 or higher for the program to reach the benchmark in each of the four areas.

Capstone Project Rubric (PLO 2)

Video Communication: Film studies students demonstrate a mastery of video communication:

All group projects were sampled: 6 total (production groups contained 5-7 students)	Capstone 4	Milestones 3	Milestones 2	Benchmark 1	Benchmark not Met 0
A1: Develop clear video concepts Communication/ Clarity: 4: 90% 3: 10% 2: 0% 1: 0% 0: 0% Benchmark met	Premise is strong and compelling and the student demonstrates significant understanding of their target audience	Demonstrates adequate understanding of concept and target audience.	Demonstrates an attempt at concept and target audience.	Minimal attention to concept and target audience.	No attention to concept and target audience
A2a Use video technique effectively Sound: 4: 0% 3: 40% 2: 10% 1: 50% 0: 0% Benchmark not met	Demonstrates skill in audio production and post. Sound levels are correct and the sound design creates an appropriate mood for the video.	Demonstrates adequate skill in audio production with few errors. For the most part sound levels are correct and the sound design contributes somewhat to the mood of the video.	Demonstrates an attempt at proper audio production, proper sound levels and appropriate sound design.	Demonstrates minimal attention to audio production, proper sound levels and appropriate sound design.	Demonstrates little or no attention to audio production, proper sound levels and appropriate sound design
A2b Editing and Post: 4: 40% 3: 40% 2: 20% 1: 0% 0: 0% Benchmark met	Transitions are smooth, the rhythm of the cuts is appropriate to each scene, Effects are well rendered and compliment the project.	Transitions are adequate, for the most part there is consideration taken to insure that the rhythm of the cuts is appropriate to each scene and that effects are well rendered.	Demonstrates an attempt at smooth transitions, appropriate rhythm and well- rendered effects.	Minimal attention and/or competence in the area of editing, smooth transitions, appropriate rhythm, and well- rendered effects.	Little or no attention and/or competence in the area of editing smooth transitions, appropriate rhythm and well rendered effects.
A2c Cinematography: 4: 40% 3: 30% 2: 20% 1: 5% 0: 5% Benchmark met	Framing, Lighting and Camera moves demonstrate strong technical skill and aesthetic awareness. The use of this technique creates a mood appropriate to the meaning of the video.	Demonstrates adequate technique in all areas of cinematography and consideration was taken to use cinematography to create a mood appropriate to the meaning of the video.	Demonstrates awareness of cinematographic technique and mood, but there are significant limitations in technical skill.	Demonstrates minimal attention to cinematography. More than half of the shots are poorly framed, haphazard, or have improper lighting. The camera work at times distracts from the video.	Demonstrates little or no attention to cinematography, framing.
A4- use appropriate cinematic conventions to convey meaning 4: 40% 3: 40% 2: 20% 1: 0% Benchmark met	Demonstrates a thorough understanding and mastery of time-based structure and the conclusion has significant impact.	Demonstrates an adequate understanding and use of time- based structure and the conclusion has significant impact.	Demonstrates an attempt at the understanding and use of time- based structure and there is also a noticeable attempt to make an impact.	Minimal attention to and understanding of time-based structure and the conclusion has some impact.	Little or no structure or interest

90% of students scored in the top percentile and 10% reached the capstone for Area 1: the development of clear video concepts. This exceeds the benchmark of 70% in this area.

Plan: The program must secure continued access to intensive scriptwriting courses (where these ideas are developed) and continue along the same path in Senior Practicum where students are required to participate in regular class critiques.

The quality of the projects can also be attributed to a screening process at the beginning of the semester. Each senior project requires a lengthy and detailed proposal outlining the project's merit, a plausibility statement and a treatment or summary. Project proposals must meet very high standards before being approved for production. This process helps to insure the projects are of the highest possible quality and that students have carefully considered video concepts before embarking on a project. This process will continue in the future.

In **area A2a (sound)** students did not do nearly as well. 0% scored in the top percentile and only 40% of the students reached the capstone. 50% met Benchmark 1. This is an incredibly low year for sound recording and it is likely due to three semesters where students were working with part-time faculty for most of the foundation technical courses. By the time students reach the senior level they should be able to deal with basic recording levels and use a variety of different recording devices. Many students were working at a beginning level in this area.

Plan: Presently we have found a more qualified part timer who has been trained to teach audio production and intermediate video production. Students absolutely must have these skills before taking ComS 185, because it is a practicum and not a course with designated class time for skills training. We have also requested to hire a full time faculty member to teach in these areas and this request is awaiting approval.

Even though Senior Practicum is not a skills or training course, I think that time needs to be spent to evaluate group members' skills level in area A2a (sound) before they embark on their projects. Some training in preparation for production will be given to students that need it.

In **area A2b Editing** and Post: Student projects did meet the benchmark in this area. 40% met the capstone and 40% met the milestone. Students in this area are very dedicated and tend to spend the most time on their projects. Only one project had unsatisfactory or haphazard editing.

Plan: We need to continue to require students to learn editing in beginning and intermediate classes in preparation for Senior Practicum

In **area A2c Cinematography** the benchmark was met, but the results were mixed. Each project presented at least two scenes with problematic lighting or shot composition. Some projects did not utilize enough of a variety of shots creating awkward transitions in editing.

Overall, I think that students are unclear about the time and effort production takes (this is true of the area of production sound as well) and they do not schedule in time for equipment set up and reshoots. This issue needs to be addressed in class more clearly. Scheduling is an issue with students in a commuter school, but it is important to make sure students make time for their productions. This is an ongoing issue that I face every year.

Plan: To clarify early on that students will be penalized heavily for production mistakes and that they need to schedule enough time for productions. To include production scheduling expectations in beginning and intermediate video production courses.

In area A4- use of appropriate cinematic conventions. The benchmark was met, but there were some mixed results. Short films require a very sophisticated sense of story structure and this can be tricky for students at this level of their studies. Looking at the projects that were less successful in this area, I have discovered that students with the most trouble never took the screenwriting class. It is very important for students to practice writing stories before making films.

Plan: During an exit interview I discovered that students were having trouble getting in to our screenwriting course. Next semester we are adding another section to insure that students can take it in preparation for intermediate and advanced level production courses.

TEAMWORK VALUE RUBRIC (PLO4)

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



Definition

Teamwork is behaviors under the control of individual team members (effort they put into team tasks, their manner of interacting with others on team, and the quantity and quality of contributions they make to team discussions.)

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

	Capstone 4	Milestones 32		Benchmark 1
1 Contributes to Team Meetings Benchmark Met	Helps the team move forward by articulating the merits of alternative ideas or proposals. (60%)	Offers alternative solutions or courses of action that build on the ideas of others. 10%	Offers new suggestions to advance the work of the group. 10%	Shares ideas but does not advance the work of the group. 20%
2 Facilitates the Contributions of Team Members	Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by both constructively building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others as well as noticing when someone is not participating and inviting them to engage. (50%)	Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by constructively building upon or synthesizing the contributions of others. (30%)	Engages team members in ways that facilitate their contributions to meetings by restating the views of other team members and/or asking questions for clarification. (10%)	Engages team members by taking turns and listening to others without interrupting. (10%)
3 Individual Contributions Outside of Team Meetings	Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished is thorough, comprehensive, and advances the project. Proactively helps other team members complete their assigned tasks to a similar level of excellence. (60%)	Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished is thorough, comprehensive, and advances the project. (20%)	Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished advances the project. (10%)	Completes all assigned tasks by deadline. (10%)
4 Fosters Constructive Team Climate	Supports a constructive team climate by doing all of the following: (70%) <ul style="list-style-type: none">Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication.Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.	Supports a constructive team climate by doing any three of the following: (0%) <ul style="list-style-type: none">Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication.Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.	Supports a constructive team climate by doing any two of the following: (10%) <ul style="list-style-type: none">Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication.Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.	Supports a constructive team climate by doing any one of the following: (20%) <ul style="list-style-type: none">Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication.Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work.Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.Provides assistance and/or encouragement to team members.
5 Responds to Conflict	Addresses destructive conflict directly and constructively, helping to manage/resolve it in a way that strengthens overall team cohesiveness and future effectiveness. (30%)	Identifies and acknowledges conflict and stays engaged with it. (40%)	Redirecting focus toward common ground, toward task at hand (away from conflict). (10%)	Passively accepts alternate viewpoints/ideas/opinions. (20%)

Teamwork Value Rubric

1. ***Contributes to Team Meetings*** (Benchmark met): 70% of students helped move projects forward by contributing to the group.

20% of students fell into the following category: *shared ideas but does not advance the work of the group*. Looking at qualitative responses it appears that this occurred for a two different reasons: 1. Students were not available or didn't make it to group meetings or scheduled production times. 2. Students were difficult to work with, they were argumentative and contrary or they were unable to deal with criticism.

Plan: This is a predictable aspect of students working together. Many students have poor time management skills and others have not learned to deal with conflict and/or criticism. The professor of the course needs to meet with students on a regular basis and deal with issues as they arise.

2. ***Facilitates the Contributions of Team Members*** (Benchmark met) 80% reached the capstone and milestone. Only 20% received scores of 2 and 1.

Plan: This is a predictable aspect of students working together. Many students have poor time management skills and others have not learned to deal with conflict and/or criticism. The professor of the course needs to meet with students on a regular basis and deal with issues as they arise.

3. ***Individual Contributions Outside of Team Meetings*** (Benchmark met) 80% reached the capstone and milestone. Only 20% received scores of 2 and 1.

4. ***Fosters Constructive Team Climate:*** (Benchmark met) 70% reached the capstone. 30% Received scores of 2 and one. Students' qualitative experience working with each other is 10% lower in this category than the others.

The criteria outlined here is mainly about cogeniality and positive communication within the group. This response shows that a small percentage of students are viewed negatively in terms of their respectfulness, teamwork and encouragement.

Plan: continue to include peer evaluations as part of the assessment and evaluation process.

Assessment Results

Students will have knowledge of discipline principles (PLG 1)

1. Students will understand contemporary practices in digital video and cinema, identify the historic development of media and film and its evolution into digital forms.

Media Assessment Exam

In Fall 2012, an assessment consisting of twenty questions was given to a random sampling of 15 students in Com S 185 (Senior Practicum). The exam covered the following areas:

- Area 1 – Camera Technology
- Area 2 – Editing Theory
- Area 3 – Camera Lenses
- Area 4 – Video Signals
- Area 5 – Audio Processing (EQ, Compressors, etc.)
- Area 6 – Time-Code
- Area 7 – Script formatting
- Area 8 – Lighting basics

To meet the program benchmark students must earn a 70%

In each area, to meet the program benchmark, 70%+ students must get the answer correct.

The following is a summary of the scores:

- Area 1 –Average understanding of camera technology. (note: part-time faculty). 75% correct answers.
- Area 2 – Below average editing theory score (note: part-time faculty). 60% correct answers.
- Area 3 – High retention of the theory of lenses. 99% correct answers.
- Area 4 –Very low understanding of video signals (note: part-time faculty). 50% correct answers.
- Area 5 – Extremely high understanding of audio processing. 100% correct answers.
- Area 6 – Poor retention of time-code fundamentals. 50% correct answers.
- Area 7 – Very high understanding of script formatting. 82% correct answers.
- Area 8 – Below Average understanding of lighting basics. 65% correct answers.

Conclusion: Professor Jenny Stark

- The program needs to spend more time introducing and developing the subjects of Time-Code basics. Time-Code is an important aspect to understanding different camera systems and how they relate to the process of non-linear editing software. I think we need to look at the assessment question and the content of the production classes and think about ways to make the topic applicable to students' current workflow.

- Since the last program review, knowledge of editing has grown, but we need to continue to improve upon this. The subject needs to be better introduced in the fundamentals classes and needs to be developed in a consistent way through the intermediate and advanced levels.
- Audio retention is quite high and that does not coincide very well with the senior project outcomes. We need to look at the assessment exam and determine whether the questions are properly assessing this outcome.
- The high retention/understanding of script formatting needs to be looked at in terms of developing other skills based areas. A random sampling of senior projects shows high marks in the area of video project concept. Good solid scripts lead to this outcome, so it is likely that the model used in *Writing Short Scripts for Film/Video* is working well.

Attributes of this class:

- A. Repetition of skills (multiple scripts and revisions throughout the semester)
- B. In class critiques (students reading and commenting on each others scripts)
- C. A small class size (25 or less)

To improve the outcome in our production skills based classes we should look at this model and if possible, attempt to include some of the above attributes in other classes.

- Below average retention of lighting basics is likely the result of multiple factors. While the Benchmark was met in the Senior projects, the results were right at 70% which is very close to the 65% outcome shown here. I think that inconsistent teaching by part-time instructors has led to low scores in this area. To solve this problem we have requested to hire a full-time faculty member who possesses skills in this area. We are hoping that a full-time position will help us achieve excellence in this very important skillset.