|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assurance of Student Learning Report**  **2022-2023** | | |
| *PCAL* | | *Communication* |
| *Certificate in Workplace Communication (Ref. 1760)* | | |
| *Holly Payne, Ph.D.* | | |
| ***Is this an online program***?  Yes  No | Please make sure the Program Learning Outcomes listed match those in CourseLeaf. Indicate verification here  Yes, they match! (If they don’t match, explain on this page under **Assessment Cycle)** | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Use this page to list learning outcomes, and measurements, and summarize results for your program. Detailed information must be completed in the subsequent pages. Add more Outcomes as needed.*** | | | |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 1: Demonstrate the importance of communication in developing strong working relationships in organizations via active listening, adaptability, conflict management, and teamwork.** | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | **Direct: Peer Assessments from COMM 349 Small Group Project** | | |
| **Instrument 2** |  | | |
| **Instrument 3** |  | | |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal of Student Learning Outcome 1.** | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 2: Identify cultural similarities and differences and adapt one’s communication to culturally diverse audiences.** | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | **Direct: Interview Project from COMM 365: Intercultural Communication** | | |
| **Instrument 2** |  | | |
| **Instrument 3** |  | | |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal of Student Learning Outcome 2.** | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 3: Demonstrate the steps of the problem-solving process with emphasis on team-building behaviors and conflict management** | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | **Direct: Decision-Making Project from COMM 349: Small Group Communication** | | |
| **Instrument 2** | **Direct: Peer Assessments from COMM 349: Small Group Communication** | | |
| **Instrument 3** |  | | |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal of Student Learning Outcome 3.** | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Assessment Cycle Plan:** | | | |
| For the 2023-2024 academic year, the same outcomes will be assessed using the same methods and courses. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 1** | | | | | |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome** | **Demonstrate the importance of communication in developing strong working relationships in organizations via active listening, adaptability, conflict management, and teamwork.** | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | **Direct: Peer Assessments from COMM 349 Small Group Project**  Students in COMM 349 work in a small group for the duration of the semester where they complete a group project. At the end of the semester, students evaluate their group mates on the following dimensions: active listening, adaptability, conflict management, and teamwork. Each team member evaluates each student on a scale of 1 (Poor) – 10 (Excellent) on each dimension by giving a composite score based on 3-4 student raters’ perceptions (see attached rubric). | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Students should reach or exceed an 8 (Proficient) in the above criteria. | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | 80% and above will earn an 8/10 on each element of the rubric. | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 100% earned 9/10 or higher on the assessment. | |
| **Methods** | Student groups in COMM 349: Small Group Communication completed peer assessments on each of their teammates using a 10-point scale (1 = Poor to 10 = Excellent) for each of the following dimensions: active listening, adaptability, conflict management, and teamwork. Composite scores were tabulated for each student enrolled in the certificate program (*n* = 4).  Mean scores were computed for each rubric category aimed at capturing the full SLO. The overall average score for this SLO was 9.21, and all of the students reached or exceeded an 8 (proficient) on each dimension. Average scores on each dimension of the rubric were as follows: active listening:  *m* = 9.44; adaptability:  *m* = 9.46; conflict management:  *m* = 9.10; teamwork:  *m* = 9.69. | | | | |
| **Based on your results, highlight whether the program met the goal of Student Learning Outcome 1.** | | | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** | | | | | |
| The Certificate students enrolled in COMM 349 exceeded the targets for SLO1. Multiple peer reports of performance on different communication dimensions such as listening, adaptability, and conflict management indicated high achievement. Interestingly, the lowest average score (9.10/10) was in the area of conflict management. This makes intuitive sense as groups are formed at the beginning of the semester and stay together for the duration; conflict is likely to be an element of team performance. Perhaps these high scores are not particularly surprising given that Communication students regularly participate in group projects, the entire course is structured around team functioning and decision-making and this is a Colonnade course where non-communication majors are enrolled and perhaps recognize the skills of their Communication Department teammates.  Students were highly rated by their peers, so no specific actions were taken other than to share the results of these scores with the course instructors.  The peer evaluation forms were adapted for assessment purposes to specifically capture the skills we would like students to demonstrate. Since a great deal of work for this course is conducted within the team units, collecting group ratings of an individual’s communication provides a multi-rater perspective of the student’s performance. We will continue to use this tool for future assessments. This SLO will be evaluated again in the 2023-2024 academic year. Data will be collected from Certificate students enrolled in the Fall and Spring semesters. | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 2** | | | | | |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome** | **Identify cultural similarities and differences and adapt one’s communication to culturally diverse audiences.** | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | **Direct: Interview Project Paper from COMM 365: Intercultural Communication**  For this paper assignment, students conducted an interview with someone from another culture and wrote a report where they discuss what they learned about the culture, their motivation to learn more about the culture, and their perceptions of how their own culture is viewed from an intercultural lens. Papers were assessed using a 5-point scale (1 as Insufficient to 5 as Excellent—see attached rubric) on the dimensions of Examines Other(s) in relation to Society/Culture and Analyze Self in relation to Other(s) and Society/Culture | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Students should exceed 3 (Satisfactory) in the above criteria. | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | 80% and above will earn a 3 out of 5 on each element of the rubric. | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 100% of students scored a 3/5 or higher. | |
| **Methods** | Faculty who teach COMM 365—Intercultural Communication assessed the Interview Project Papers from the five certificate students enrolled in the course in the Fall 2022 and Spring 2023 semesters. After student names were deleted from each paper, the papers were distributed to two faculty members who teach courses in the certificate program. Each paper had two reviewers. Mean scores were computed for each rubric category aimed at capturing the full SLO. The overall average score for this SLO was 3.68 with 100% of students meeting or exceeding 3 (satisfactory). The mean scores for each dimension were as follows: Examines Other(s) in relation to society/culture: *m* = 3.80 and Analyzes Self in relation to Other(s) and Society/Culture:  *m* = 3.55. Raters also provided qualitative comments on the student projects citing strengths in the level of motivation students displayed in learning about different cultures and in accurately capturing nuances of their studied cultures. | | | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal of Student Learning Outcome 2.** | | | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** | | | | | |
| One hundred percent of students met or exceeded proficiency in this area. That said, raters would like to see a more nuanced examination of the students’ cultural standpoint in terms of how their culture differs from that of their interviewees. Raters recommended that students focus on applying more theoretical constructs such as Hofstede’s model of culture to provide empirical support for their observations, comparisons, and conclusions. Faculty teaching the course will modify the assignment instructions to include the use of theoretical concepts and discussion of students’ personal cultural standpoints. This SLO will remain the same for the next assessment cycle. Progress toward improving use of theory will be a focal point for improvements in the 2023-2024 academic year. | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 3** | | | | | | | |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome** | **Demonstrate the steps of the problem-solving process with emphasis on team-building behaviors and conflict management** | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | **Direct: Decision-Making Project from COMM 349: Small Group Communication**  In this paper assignment, students apply the steps of the decision-making process in solving a critical problem. Students demonstrate knowledge of the procedural problem-solving model (PMOPS) by completing each step: 1. analyze a problem, 2. generate possible alternatives, 3. evaluate possible alternatives, 4. choose the best solution, and 5. implement the solution. We evaluated projects based on the level at which they performed each step. Projects were assessed on the above dimensions using a 5-point scale (1 as Insufficient to 5 Excellent—see attached rubric). | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Students should exceed 3.5 (Proficient in the above criteria.) | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | | 70% and above will score a 3.5 or above on each element of the rubric. | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 100% earned a 3.5 or above. | |
| **Methods** | The Communication faculty assessed all Group Decision Making Projects from the four certificate students enrolled in COMM 349: Small Group Communication for the Fall 2022 and Spring 2023 semesters. The papers were distributed to two faculty members who hold a Ph.D. in Communication and teach courses in the certificate program (representing 33% of the total Ph.D. faculty teaching in the program). Reviewers submitted the evaluations electronically. Each paper had two reviewers. Mean scores were computed for each rubric category aimed at capturing the full SLO. The overall average score for this SLO was 3.93 with 100% of students exceeding 3.5 (proficient). Finer analysis was conducted to capture the level at which students applied each step of the decision-making process with the following scores: Problem Description (*m* = 4.17), Problem Identification (*m* = 3.83), Criteria for Evaluating Solutions (*m* = 4.00), Evaluation of Alternatives (*m* = 3.83), Recommended Solutions (*m* = 3.83), and Implementation Plan (*m* = 3.92). Raters also provided qualitative comments on the student projects citing strengths in defining and researching problems and proposing solutions. Raters recommended students focus more on solving the identified problem as opposed to treating their tabletop event as the problem to be solved. | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | **Direct: Peer Assessments from COMM 349 Small Group Project**  Students in COMM 349 work in a small group for the duration of the semester where they complete a group project. At the end of the semester, students evaluate their group mates on the following dimensions: active listening, adaptability, conflict management, and teamwork. Each team member evaluates each student on a scale of 1 (Poor) – 10 (Excellent) on each dimension by giving a composite score based on 3-4 student raters’ perceptions (see attached rubric). | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Students should reach or exceed an 8 (Proficient) in the above criteria. | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | 80% and Above should score an 8/10 on the rubric. | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | | 100% scored an 8 or higher on each element of the rubric. | |
| **Methods** | Student groups in COMM 349: Small Group Communication completed peer assessments on each of their teammates using a 10-point scale (1 = Poor to 10 = Excellent) for each of the following dimensions: active listening, adaptability, conflict management, and teamwork. Composite scores were tabulated for each student enrolled in the certificate program (n = 4).  Mean scores were computed for each rubric category aimed at capturing the full SLO. The overall average score for this SLO was 9.21, and all of the students reached or exceeded an 8 (proficient) on each dimension. Average scores on each dimension of the rubric were as follows: active listening:  *m* = 9.44; adaptability:  *m* = 9.46; conflict management:  *m* = 9.10; teamwork:  *m* = 9.69.  Student groups in COMM 349: Small Group Communication completed peer assessments on each of their teammates using a 10-point scale (1 = Poor to 10 = Excellent) for each of the following dimensions: active listening, adaptability, conflict management, and teamwork. Composite scores were tabulated for each student enrolled in the certificate program (n = 4). | | | | | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal of Student Learning Outcome 3.** | | | | | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** | | | | | | | |
| Students demonstrated proficiency in following the steps of the problem-solving process and in engaging in constructive teamwork behaviors. Raters recommended students focus more on solving the identified problem as opposed to treating their tabletop event as the problem to be solved. Therefore, instructors of the course in the 2022-2023 academic year will emphasize in the project guidelines that students focus more on how their solutions will directly solve the problem they have identified. This SLO will remain the same for the next assessment cycle in 2023-2024. Data will be collected from Certificate students in the Fall and Spring semester.  For Instrument 2, students were highly rated by their peers, so no specific actions were taken other than to share the results of these scores with the course instructors.  The peer evaluation forms were adapted for assessment purposes to specifically capture the skills we would like students to demonstrate. Since a great deal of work for this course is conducted within the team units, collecting group ratings of an individual’s communication provides a multi-rater perspective of the student’s performance. We will continue to use this tool for future assessments. This SLO will be evaluated again in the 2023-2024 academic year. Data will be collected from Certificate students enrolled in the Fall and Spring semesters. | | | | | | | |

**\*\*\* Please include Curriculum Map (below/next page) as part of this document**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program name:** | Certificate in Workplace Communication (Ref. 1760) | | |  |  |
| **Department:** | Communication | | |  |  |
| **College:** | PCAL | | |  |  |
| **Contact person:** | Holly Payne, Ph.D. | | |  |  |
| **Email:** | [holly.payne@wku.edu](mailto:holly.payne@wku.edu) | | |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **KEY:** | |  |  |  |  |
| **I = Introduced** | |  |  |  |  |
| **R = Reinforced/Developed** | |  |  |  |  |
| **M = Mastered** | |  |  |  |  |
| **A = Assessed** | |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | **Learning Outcomes** |  |  |
|  |  |  | **LO1:** | **LO2:** | **LO3:** |
|  |  |  | Demonstrate the importance of communication in developing strong working relationships in organizations via active listening, adaptability, conflict management, and teamwork. | Identify cultural similarities and differences and adapt one’s communication to culturally diverse audiences. | Demonstrate the steps of the problem-solving process with emphasis on team-building behaviors and conflict management. |
| **Course Subject** | **Number** | **Course Title** |  |  |  |
| COMM | 145 | Fund Speaking/Communication | I | I | I |
| COMM | 240 | Effective Listening | R | R | R |
| COMM | 349 | Small Group Communication | M | R | M |
| COMM | 330 | Leadership Communication | M | R | R |
| COMM | 348 | Interpersonal Communication | M | R |  |
| COMM | 365 | Intercultural Communication | M | M |  |

**SLO1 and SLO3: Demonstrate the importance of communication in developing strong relationships in organizations via active listening, adaptability, conflict management, and teamwork.**

On a scale of 10 to 1, evaluate each member of your team according to the attributes listed. Write each team members’ name across the top and assign a number in the space provided for each question. Total each column in the row called Total Contribution of This Member.



|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Write in Team Members’ Names**  **(NOT including yourself)** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1, **Active Listening** – Practiced active listening and was engaged in group conversations. Listened to others’ ideas and opinions and responded appropriately. Was receptive to differing viewpoints. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. **Adaptability** – Responded positively to the fluidity of group work. Adapted to make changes when necessary. Maintained a good attitude and tried to meet group expectations even when plans changed. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. **Conflict Management** – Handled conflict positively and addressed problems when needed. Employed appropriate conflict management skills to work through any disagreements and make constructive group decisions. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. **Teamwork** – Attended meetings and kept in touch with other members. Participated in group discussions, added useful ideas, and was well prepared at team meetings. Took on major responsibility for completion of the project (e.g., research, writing, etc). Completed her/his assigned task(s)/role(s) with little or no assistance. Contributed his/her best work in a timely manner to help the team accomplish its goal. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. **Overall** – Rate your overall experience with this person as a team member. To what extent would you want to work with this person again? |  |  |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL CONTRIBUTION OF THIS MEMBER (Add #’s 1-5)** |  |  |  |  |  |

This evaluation represents my honest evaluation of my team members’ contributions**. I have written any necessary additional comments/explanations on the back of this form.**

### Signature \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Workplace Communication Certificate Assessment: COMM 365 (Interview Project Paper)**

SLO2: Identify cultural similarities and differences and adapt one’s communication to culturally diverse audiences.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Rubric** | **Insufficient**  **1** | **Emerging/Poor**  **2** | **Developing/Satisfactory**  **3** | **Competent/Good**  **4** | **Excellent/Superior**  **5** |
| ***Examines Other(s) in relation to Society/Culture*** | Has little interest in learning about peoples and cultures; cannot discern individual and cultural differences; lacks awareness of the connection between culture and communication; views the communication event egocentrically | Does not adequately convey interest in learning about peoples and cultures; has trouble discerning individual and cultural differences; does not make strong connections between culture and communication | Shows interest in learning about peoples and cultures; has a developing understanding of cultures, cultural values, and practices, but views cultural differences in others as an extension of own self and culture; shows some awareness of the connection between culture and communication | Shows an understanding of culture(s), cultural norms and practices other than one’s own; appreciates individual and cultural similarities and differences; articulates how socio-cultural systems of other(s) affect messages; clearly articulates the connection between culture and communication | Demonstrates deep and specific understanding of cultures and cultural values and practices of others; appreciates (specific and detailed) similarities and differences between the individual and the larger cultural group; effectively interprets and evaluates how socio-cultural systems of other(s) affect communication messages and communication event |
| ***Analyzes Self in relation to Other(s) and Society/Culture*** | Lacks self-awareness of how one’s own cultural standpoint affects communication and the communication event; rudimentary reflection on one’s messages after the communication event; fails to evaluate the efficacy of one’s  communicative goals | Does not adequately demonstrate self-awareness of how one’s own cultural standpoint affects communication and the communication event; provides a basic reflection on one’s messages after the communication event; minimally evaluates the efficacy of one’s communicative goals | Shows some cultural self-awareness and how one’s cultural standpoint affects communication and the communication event; reflects on one’s messages after the communication event; rudimentary articulation and/or evaluation of the efficacy of one’s communicative goals | Clearly demonstrates cultural self-awareness and how one’s cultural standpoint affects communication and the communication event; reflects on one’s own messages and barriers that impeded communication after the communication event; clearly articulates and evaluates the efficacy of one’s communication goals | Demonstrates deep understanding of intersections of one’s socio-cultural systems and one’s cultural standpoint on communication and the communication event; critically reflects on one’s own messages and barriers after the communication event; critically evaluates personal communication strengths and weaknesses and the efficacy of one’s communication goals |

**Workplace Communication Certificate Assessment**

**SLO3: Demonstrate the steps of the problem-solving process with emphasis on team-building behaviors.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **EXCELLENT**  **5** | **PROFICIENT**  **4** | **DEVELOPING**  **3** | **WEAK**  **2** | **INSUFFICIENT**  **1** |
| **Problem Description & Analysis** | Clearly identifies the main problem and subsidiary, embedded, or implicit aspects of the problem; Identifies not only the basics of the issue but also subtle nuances of the issue such as history, context, and past/ current programs/efforts to address the issue. Utilizes relevant sources to demonstrate thorough research and understanding of the issue. | Clearly identifies the main problem and includes some subsidiary issues; Some discussion of relationships between issues.  Utilizes relevant sources to demonstrate sufficient research and understanding of the issue. | Clearly identifies the main problem but does not provide depth on subsidiary issues or the connections between them. Utilizes relevant sources to demonstrate some research and understanding of the issue. | Rudimentary problem identification. Identifies the main problem but omits relevant issues. Does not identify the relationship between different aspects of issues within the problem. Utilizes some sources to demonstrate research but only a surface-level understanding of the issue. | Does not clearly identify the problem; Identifies an inappropriate problem or represents the issue inaccurately. Fails to utilize relevant sources to demonstrate adequate research and understanding of the issue. |
| **Identification of Possible Solutions** | Utilizes more than one creative thinking technique to generate a variety of possible solutions. Proposed solutions indicate a deep comprehension of the problem. Solutions clearly address the problem, are sensitive to contextual factors, and are completely consistent with the evidence provided. | Utilizes more than one creative thinking technique to generate a variety of possible solutions. Proposed solutions indicate a general comprehension of the problem. Solutions are sensitive to contextual factors, but one or more is inconsistent with the evidence provided. | May utilize only one creative thinking technique and/or may generate an insufficient number of possible solutions. Proposed solutions appear to be more “off the shelf” rather than individually designed to address the contextual factors of the problem and considers little of the evidence provided. | Struggles to utilize one or more creative thinking techniques appropriately. May generate a limited number of solutions or proposed solutions may only indirectly address the issue/problem | Did not identify a creative thinking technique to demonstrate how possible solutions were generated. Proposes one or more solutions that contradict the evidence provided or does not address the issue/problem. |
| **Assessment of Options/Evaluation of Alternatives** | Utilizes thoughtful evaluation criteria that are clearly relevant and critical to the issue/problem. Offers a persuasive rationalization for the selection of those criteria. Thoroughly applies criteria to evaluate each possible solution. Makes a realistic assessment of the feasibility and impact of each alternative. | Utilizes thoughtful evaluation criteria that are clearly relevant to the issue/problem. Offers an adequate but less thorough rationalization for the selection of those criteria. Adequately applies criteria to  Evaluate each possible solution. Assesses the feasibility and impact of each alternative but with less detail. | Utilizes evaluation criteria but their relevance to the issue/problem is less clear. Offers little rationalization for why particular criteria were selected. Applies criteria to evaluate each possible solution but may only address either feasibility or impact. | Identifies evaluation criteria but does not demonstrate relevance to the issue/problem. Fails to offer a rationalization for why particular criteria were selected. | Fails to identify relevant evaluation criteria and/or does not apply them consistently across all possible solutions. Evaluation of solutions is superficial (for example, contains cursory, surface-level explanation) and fails to consider the feasibility and impact of potential solutions. |
| **Recommended Solution/Rationale for Choice** | Provides an in-depth and logical justification for the recommended solution including at least one credible source. Clearly applies the RISK technique to predict potential shortcomings of the proposed solution and ways to prevent/address those potential problems. | Provides a reasonable justification for the recommended solution, but the source cited doesn’t provide strong support. Includes the RISK technique including potential shortcomings and ways to prevent/address them. | Provides an adequate justification for the recommended solution but needs to develop a more in- depth rationale for the decision including a stronger supporting source. Includes the RISK technique but lacks a detailed description of potential problems and preventions. | Provides a cursory justification for the recommended solution. May not provide a source for support, and does not provide enough detail on the RISK technique. | Fails to provide a rationale for the chosen solution. Does not offer support or justification using sources and/or fails to apply the RISK technique. |
| **Implementation Plan** | Develops a detailed, specific, clear, and reasonable plan for implementation including a detailed PERT chart outlining necessary action steps. | Develops a good, clear plan for implementation including PERT chart details. | Develops a plan for implementation but may have elements that are not practical or efficient. Includes a less detailed PERT chart. | Develops a shallow implementation plan that may lack important action steps or may not be reasonable. Lacks important PERT chart details. | Develops an unreasonable implementation plan that is likely to be unsuccessful. Fails to provide a PERT chart or the details do not fit the scope of the issues identified. |