| Assurance of Student Learning 2018-2019 | |
|---|---|
| Potter College | Communication |
| Communicating in Organizations Certificate 0471 | |

| Use this page to list learning outcomes, measurements, and summarize results for your program. Detailed information must be completed in the subsequent pages. | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Student Learning Outcome 1:** Applies organizational communication theory to analyze how communication functions in organizations. | | |
| Instrument 1 | Direct: Analysis of a course assignment paper. | |
| Instrument 2 | Indirect: Faculty decisions based on disciplinary and professional engagement, including the CAPE review process, analysis of market trends, such as found in the KCEWS Statewide Skills Data on 2017-21 KY workforce demand, and ability to meet the professional standards of our discipline (as seen through presentations and publications of students). | |
| Instrument 3 | | |
| Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1. | Met | **Not Met** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2:** Identifies communication elements/processes that affect communicating in organizations. | | |
| Instrument 1 | Direct: Analysis of a course assignment paper. | |
| Instrument 2 | Indirect: Faculty decisions based on disciplinary and professional engagement, including the CAPE review process, analysis of market trends, such as found in the KCEWS Statewide Skills Data on 2017-21 KY workforce demand, and ability to meet the professional standards of our discipline (as seen through presentations and publications of students). | |
| Instrument 3 | | |
| Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2. | **Met** | Not Met |
| **Student Learning Outcome 3:** Evaluates communication behaviors/processes in organizational contexts. | | |
| Instrument 1 | Direct: Analysis of a course assignment paper. | |
| Instrument 2 | Indirect: Faculty decisions based on disciplinary and professional engagement, including the CAPE review process, analysis of market trends, such as found in the KCEWS Statewide Skills Data on 2017-21 KY workforce demand, and ability to meet the professional standards of our discipline (as seen through presentations and publications of students). | |
| Instrument 3 | | |
| Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3. | Met | **Not Met** |
| **Program Summary** (Briefly summarize the action and follow up items from your detailed responses on subsequent pages.) | | |

The Communicating in Organizations certificate provides students the opportunity to develop an in-depth understanding of how communication functions in organizations. Using foundational and current research in the field, students are exposed to organizational communication theory and processes. Students will take graduate courses that focus on general organizational communication theory, applied organizational communication, communication within specific organizational contexts, and one other course chosen by participants as especially relevant to their own work and interests.

Overall, the result from this assessment indicate that the mean scores of the sampled student papers for the two SLOs fall short of the self-reported goals. This owes to the fact that the program lacked a clearly articulated learning outcomes for assessment purposes. The SLOs used for this year's assessment were developed out of the program description, but the sampled student work was selected before the SLOs were articulated. As a consequence, the results of this year's assessment do not accurately reflect the learning outcomes of our certificate students. Had the SLOs been articulated first and then sought he course instructor to identify an appropriate student work, then the assessment for this year would have been more valid.

The following recommendations came out of this year's assessment.
- Articulate explicit learning outcomes for the program.
    o Are the learning outcomes formulated well?
    o Are the learning outcomes measurable?
- Examine learning outcomes of courses and program outcomes.
- Provide a clear guideline for developing course paper or student work that can serve as appropriate measure for program assessment.
- Establish a more comprehensive rubric to measure learning from course paper of courses that are part of the program.
- Assess all of the students in the targeted course, rather than assessing sampled student papers.
- Revisit the correlation matrix on a yearly basis to ensure students are given the opportunity to achieve program SLOs through course work.
    o Review program mission and outcomes.
    o Ensure program outcomes are met through the courses.

| Student Learning Outcome 1 | |
|---|---|
| **Student Learning Outcome** | Applies organizational communication theory to analyze how communication functions in organizations. |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | DIRECT measure of student learning: Students in the course of the program had a 3-page paper where they were required to apply communication theory and/or concept to analyze how communication functions in multinational organizational contexts. The paper was assessed for the select program SLOs. |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Due to the fact that there is no capstone course or core courses for this certificate, a course from one of the two elective categories is an apt site to assess for student learning outcomes. Three quarters of students in the course should score "proficient" or higher on the rubric developed from program learning outcomes. Scores on the rubric item for this SLO ranged from "insufficient (1 point)," "weak (2 point)," "proficient (3 points)," and "excellent (4 points)." |

| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | 75% | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 40% |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Methods** | Direct: Artifact from the core course paper were collected from 5 out of 11 students in the course (n = 5) and all identifiers removed (e.g. student name, course name, and faculty name). The papers were split among two full-time graduate faculty who teach communication so that each paper was read twice by two different reviewers. The mean of the reviewer scores were used as the final score. The rubric (see below for the assessment rubric) used for scoring was developed from the program learning outcomes; for this SLO, there was a single corresponding rubric item which could be scored along four different levels. | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | INDIRECT measure of student learning: Faculty decisions based on disciplinary and professional engagement, including the CAPE review process, analysis of market trends, such as found in the KCEWS Statewide Skills Data on 2017-21 KY workforce demand, and ability to meet the professional standards of our discipline (as seen through presentations and publications of students). | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Success with gaining internships, conference participation and presentation, and success at jobs after graduation. | | |

| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | N/A | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Methods** | Faculty members engage in informal and ongoing conversation within the department and at conferences in their discipline, current reading on higher education trends and workforce trends, and communicate with alumni. | | |

| Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1. | Met | Not Met |
|---|---|---|

**Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement.  The actions should include a timeline.)

A more appropriate student work will be chosen to assess the program for the 2019-20 assessment, because there was a mismatch between the sampled work and the measurement criteria for this year's assessment. For a more valid assessment in future, program learning outcomes will need to be articulated for 2019-2020 and all of the students in the target course will be assessed. The graduate program committee will review program mission and outcomes, examine learning outcomes of courses and program outcomes, establish a more comprehensive rubric to measure learning from course paper of courses that are part of the program, and revisit the correlation matrix on a yearly basis to ensure students are given the opportunity to achieve program SLOs through course work so that both program outcomes and SLOs are met through the courses.

**Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up.  If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)

In April/May 2020, the graduate program committee will review program mission and outcomes, examine learning outcomes of courses and program outcomes, establish a more comprehensive rubric to measure learning from course paper of courses that are part of the program.

| Student Learning Outcome 2 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Student Learning Outcome** | Identifies communication elements/processes that affect communicating in organizations. | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | DIRECT measure of student learning: Students in the course of the program had a 3-page paper where they were required to apply communication theory and/or concept to analyze how communication functions in multinational organizational contexts. The paper was assessed for the select program SLOs. | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Due to the fact that there is no capstone course or core courses for this certificate, a course from one of the two elective categories is an apt site to assess for student learning outcomes. Three quarters of students in the course should score "proficient" or higher on the rubric developed from program learning outcomes. Scores on the rubric item for this SLO ranged from "insufficient (1 point)," "weak (2 point)," "proficient (3 points)," and "excellent (4 points)." | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | 75% | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 80% |
| **Methods** | Direct: Artifact from the core course paper were collected from 5 out of 11 students in the course (n = 5) and all identifiers removed (student name, course name, and faculty name). The papers were split among two full-time graduate faculty who teach communication so that each paper was read twice by two different reviewers. The mean of the reviewer scores were used as the final score. The rubric used for scoring was developed from the program learning outcomes; for this SLO, there was a single corresponding rubric item which could be scored along four different levels. | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | INDIRECT measure of student learning: Faculty decisions based on disciplinary and professional engagement, including the CAPE review process, analysis of market trends, such as found in the KCEWS Statewide Skills Data on 2017-21 KY workforce demand, and ability to meet the professional standards of our discipline (as seen through presentations and publications of students). | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Success with gaining internships, conference participation and presentation, and success at jobs after graduation. | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | N/A | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | N/A |
| **Methods** | Faculty members engage in informal and ongoing conversation within the department and at conferences in their discipline, current reading on higher education trends and workforce trends, and communicate with alumni. | | |

| Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2. | **Met** | Not Met |
|---|---|---|

**Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)

A more appropriate student work will be chosen to assess the program for the 2019-20 assessment, because there was a mismatch between the sampled work and the measurement criteria for this year's assessment. For a more valid assessment in future, program learning outcomes will need to be articulated for 2019-2020 and all of the students in the target course will be assessed. The graduate program committee will review program mission and outcomes, examine learning outcomes of courses and program outcomes, establish a more comprehensive rubric to measure learning from course paper of courses that are part of the program, and revisit the correlation matrix on a yearly basis to ensure students are given the opportunity to achieve program SLOs through course work so that both program outcomes and SLOs are met through the courses.

**Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)

In April/May 2020, the graduate program committee will review program mission and outcomes, examine learning outcomes of courses and program outcomes, establish a more comprehensive rubric to measure learning from course paper of courses that are part of the program.

## Student Learning Outcome 3

| | |
|---|---|
| **Student Learning Outcome** | Evaluates communication behaviors/processes in organizational contexts. |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | DIRECT measure of student learning: Students in the course of the program had a 3-page paper where they were required to apply communication theory and/or concept to analyze how communication functions in multinational organizational contexts. The paper was assessed for the select program SLOs. |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Due to the fact that there is no capstone course or core courses for this certificate, a course from one of the two elective categories is an apt site to assess for student learning outcomes. Three quarters of students in the course should score "proficient" or higher on the rubric developed from program learning outcomes. Scores on the rubric item for this SLO ranged from "insufficient (1 point)," "weak (2 point)," "proficient (3 points)," and "excellent (4 points)." |

| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | 75% | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 40% |
|---|---|---|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| **Methods** | Direct: Artifact from the core course paper were collected from 5 out of 11 students in the course (n = 5) and all identifiers removed (student name, course name, and faculty name). The papers were split among two full-time graduate faculty who teach communication so that each paper was read twice by two different reviewers. The mean of the reviewer scores were used as the final score. The rubric used for scoring was developed from the program learning outcomes; for this SLO, there was a single corresponding rubric item which could be scored along four different levels. |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | INDIRECT measure of student learning: Faculty decisions based on disciplinary and professional engagement, including the CAPE review process, analysis of market trends, such as found in the KCEWS Statewide Skills Data on 2017-21 KY workforce demand, and ability to meet the professional standards of our discipline (as seen through presentations and publications of students). |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Success with gaining internships, conference participation and presentation, and success at jobs after graduation. |

| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | N/A | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| **Methods** | Faculty members engage in informal and ongoing conversation within the department and at conferences in their discipline, current reading on higher education trends and workforce trends, and communicate with alumni. |

| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | **Met** | **Not Met** |
|---|---|---|

**Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)

A more appropriate student work will be chosen to assess the program for the 2019-20 assessment, because there was a mismatch between the sampled work and the measurement criteria for this year's assessment. For a more valid assessment in future, program learning outcomes will need to be articulated for 2019-2020 and all of the students in the target course will be assessed. The graduate program committee will review program mission and outcomes, examine learning outcomes of courses and program outcomes, establish a more comprehensive rubric to measure learning from course paper of courses that are part of the program, and revisit the correlation matrix on a yearly basis to ensure students are given the opportunity to achieve program SLOs through course work so that both program outcomes and SLOs are met through the courses.

**Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)

In Spring 2020, the graduate program committee will review program mission and outcomes, examine learning outcomes of courses and program outcomes, establish a more comprehensive rubric to measure learning from course paper of courses that are part of the program.

# Certificate in Communicating in Organizations Assessment Rubric

**CCO.SLO.1. - Applies organizational communication theory to analyze how communication functions in organizations.**

| Regarding the paper, please assess how well the author applies organizational communication theory to analyze how communication functions by selecting the most appropriate category below. | |
| --- | --- |
| | **EXCELLENT** - Very clearly applies the theories/concepts to an organizational issue, illustrating strong understanding of the theories/concepts, illuminating corresponding communication elements present in organizational context. |
| | **PROFICIENT** - Clearly applies the theories/concepts to an organizational issue, illustrating good understanding of the theories/concepts, illuminating some corresponding communication elements present in the organizational problem. |
| | **WEAK** - Somewhat applies theories/concepts to an organizational issue or the issue is not organizational in nature, does not clearly illustrate basic understanding of the theories/concepts nor effectively illuminate corresponding communication elements present in the organizational problem. |
| | **INSUFFICIENT** - Fails to apply theories/concepts to an organizational issue, failed to illustrate an understanding of the theories/concepts or illuminate corresponding communication elements present in the organizational problem. |

**CCO.SLO.2. - Identifies communication elements/processes that affect communicating in organizations.**

| Regarding the paper, please assess how effective the author identifies communication elements/processes in organizations by selecting the most appropriate category below. | |
| --- | --- |
| | **EXCELLENT** - Demonstrates excellence and proficiency in describing, explaining, or identifying communication elements or processes in organizational context. |
| | **PROFICIENT** - Demonstrates acceptable proficiency in describing, explaining, or identifying communication elements or processes in organizational context. |
| | **WEAK** - Demonstrates minimal proficiency in describing, explaining, or identifying communication elements or processes in organizational context. |
| | **INSUFFICIENT** - Fails to demonstrate minimal proficiency in describing, explaining, or identifying communication elements or processes in organizational context. |

**CCO.SLO.3. - Evaluates communication behaviors/processes in organizational contexts.**

| | |
|---|---|
| *Regarding the paper, please assess how well the author integrates scholarship to critically examine and solve organizational issue(s) at hand by selecting the most appropriate category below.* | |
| | **EXCELLENT** - Effectively integrates scholarship in a way that demonstrates excellent critical thinking and problem-solving to the communication need(s) of the organization. |
| | **PROFICIENT** - Integrates scholarship in a way that demonstrates critical thinking and problem-solving to the communication need(s) of the organization. |
| | **WEAK** - Minimally integrates scholarship and demonstrates cursory critical thinking and problem-solving to the communication need(s) of the organization. |
| | **INSUFFICIENT** - Fails to integrate scholarship and provides limited evidence of critical thinking and problem-solving to the communication need(s) of the organization. |

**CCO.SLO.4. - Language and APA.**

| | |
|---|---|
| *Regarding the paper, please assess the author's writing skills and use of APA by selecting the most appropriate category below.* | |
| | **EXCELLENT** - Scholarly and precise use of language; all written materials follow current APA guidelines including in-text citations and reference page. |
| | **PROFICIENT** - Some mechanical difficulties, occasional problematic word choices, or awkward syntax errors; written materials only have minor APA errors in the in-text citations and reference page. |
| | **WEAK** - Major grammar errors, awkward syntax, and occasional imprecise diction; written materials contain several issues in following current APA guidelines including in-text citations and reference page. |
| | **INSUFFICIENT** - Frequent major and minor grammar problems, or imprecise diction that impede meaning; writing does not follow current APA guidelines. |