Assurance of Student Learning 2018-2019	
Potter College	Communication
Organizational Communication 0012	

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: Demonstrate mastery in written communication		
Instrument 1	**Direct: Capstone Project (Thesis/Non-thesis options)**	
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: Explain theories and concepts		
Instrument 1	**Direct: Capstone Project (Thesis/Non-thesis options)**	
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: Demonstrate ability to apply communication concepts in organizational contexts		
Instrument 1	**Direct: Capstone Project (Thesis/Non-thesis options)**	
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.)		

Overall, the result from this assessment indicate that students who complete our program successfully achieve the program learning outcomes. This is owed to our program instituting a significant revision in Fall 2012 after conducting a benchmark analysis, student surveys, and a SWOT analysis aimed at understanding disciplinary changes and student need. Our current program learning outcomes are as follow:

1. Demonstrate mastery in research
2. Demonstrate mastery in written communication
3. Explain theories and concepts
4. Identify distinct communication practices of culturally diverse groups
5. Demonstrate ability to apply communication concepts in organizational contexts

For individual courses, these learning outcomes are assessed using multiple tools such as exams, application papers, presentations, research proposals, and qualitative, quantitative, and rhetorically grounded primary research studies. For the program as a whole, the above learning outcomes are assessed through the capstone experience, whether that is the thesis-track or the non-thesis track. In other words, learning outcome assessment for the program as a whole has been embedded in the capstone experience. For purposes of the 2018-2019 ASL assessment, we decided to assess learning outcomes 2, 3, and 5. The assessment results for this year suggest there is no need for program improvement or change. In next year's assessment, learning outcomes 1, 2, and 4 will be assessed to gather a more comprehensive picture of the quality of student learning in relation to the program learning outcomes.

Student Learning Outcome 1	
Student Learning Outcome	Demonstrate mastery in written communication
Measurement Instrument 1	DIRECT measure of student learning: For the thesis track, students complete an original research and successfully defend their thesis. A thesis typically focuses on answering a specialized question(s) in communication research. In their first semester of thesis work, students prepare a prospectus, which includes a rationale, literature review, methodology sections, and a timeline for thesis completion. When they successfully defend their prospectus, they then proceed with the rest of the research project to collect, analyze data, and then write up the findings and implications in their second semester of the thesis work. Completion of a thesis depends on student demonstrating mastery in written communication. For the non-thesis track, students must take the comprehensive exam for their degree completion. The exam is composed of three questions to assess each of the following: theoretical knowledge, methodological mastery, and application of theories and concepts to specific context. The design of the exam and the questions written by faculty take into account the learning outcomes. Students must demonstrate mastery in written communication to convey their knowledge, critical thinking, and application skills.
Criteria for Student Success	In the case of the thesis track, student should successfully defend their thesis. In the case of the non-thesis track, the student must "Pass" their comprehensive exam for each of the areas tested. Student exam paper is evaluated by a set of rubrics adapted from the Widener University Doctor of Education Program (see attachment). The first rubric for the theory answer assesses for concept mastery, foundational content, literature use, organization, and language. The second rubric for the method answer assesses for the link of problem to design, research design, method, measurement, procedures, data analysis, and quality of writing. The third rubric for the application answer assesses on concepts, application to problem/case, literature use, organization, and language. Scores for each dimension per area range from "Insufficient" (1 point), "Emergent" (2 points), "Proficient" (3 points), and "Distinguished" (4 points). The scores from each dimension in each question area are summed up, which are then translated by a scale to determine success level into Fail, Pass, or Pass with Honors. To get a "Pass" on their exam answer, students must receive 13 out of a maximum of 20 points and no more than two individual dimension below "emergent" for each question area from each of their faculty committee member. For a score that is 18 or above, they are earmarked as "Pass with Honors." For the final step, scores from the committee members are combined by each question area, and then translated by a scale to determine success level. If the total combined score for each question area is less than 38, it is "Fail." If the combined score is 39-53 points, it gets "Pass." For scores that are 54 or above, with 60 points being maximum possible points, it gets "Pass with Honors."

Program Success Target for this Measurement	100%	**Percent of Program Achieving Target**	100%

Methods	Direct: Artifacts from capstone experience (N = 7) were used for this assessment. For student who have chosen the thesis track (n = 1), three faculty who are members of the student's thesis committee reviewed their work and approved of its quality before the student was allowed to defend it orally. For students who chose the comprehensive exam (n = 6), three faculty members of their exam committee read and assessed the exam answers independently using the set of rubrics mentioned above. For this SLO, scores from all areas of the exam were relevant.
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.)			
All students have successfully either defended their thesis or passed their comprehensive exam in their first attempt. Thus, these results have not indicated a need for program improvement or change.			
Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)			
None planned for now.			

Student Learning Outcome 2	
Student Learning Outcome	Explain theories and concepts
Measurement Instrument 1	DIRECT measure of student learning: For the thesis track, students complete an original research and successfully defend their thesis. A thesis typically focuses on answering a specialized question(s) in communication research. In their first semester of thesis work, students prepare a prospectus, which includes a rationale, literature review, methodology sections, and a timeline for thesis completion. When they successfully defend their prospectus, they then proceed with the rest of the research project to collect, analyze data, and then write up the findings and implications in their second semester of the thesis work. Completion of a thesis means the student has explained theories and concepts relevant to their research focus. For the non-thesis track, students must take the comprehensive exam for their degree completion. The exam is composed of three questions to assess each of the following areas: theoretical knowledge, methodological mastery, and application of theories and concepts to specific context. The design of the exam and the questions written by faculty take into account the learning outcomes.
Criteria for Student Success	In the case of the thesis track, student should successfully defend their thesis. In the case of the non-thesis track, the student must receive a "Pass" level or higher, specifically get 45 points or more when all committee member scores are combined for the Theory/Foundations area of their comprehensive exam. Their exam paper is evaluated by a set of rubrics adapted from the Widener University Doctor of Education Program (see attachment). The rubric for the theory/foundations answer assess for concept mastery, foundational content, literature use, organization, and language. Scores for each dimension per area range from "Insufficient" (1 point), "Emergent" (2 points), "Proficient" (3 points), and "Distinguished" (4 points). To successfully achieve this learning outcome, students must receive 13 out of a maximum of 20 points and no more than two individual dimension below "emergent" for each question area from each of their faculty committee member. For a score that is 18 or above, they are earmarked as "Pass with Honors." For the final step, scores from the committee members are combined by each question area, and then translated by a scale to determine success level. If the total combined score for each question area is less than 38, it is "Fail." If the combined score is 39-53 points, it gets "Pass." For scores that are 54 or above, with 60 points being maximum possible points, it gets "Pass with Honors."

Program Success Target for this Measurement	100%	**Percent of Program Achieving Target**	100%

Methods	Direct: Artifacts from capstone experience (N = 7) were used for this assessment. For student who have chosen the thesis track (n =1), three faculty who are members of the student's thesis committee reviewed their work and approved of its quality before the student was allowed to defend it orally. For students who chose the comprehensive exam (n = 6), three faculty members of their exam committee read and assessed the exam answers independently using the set of rubrics mentioned above. For this SLO, scores from the theory/foundations section was used for this assessment.
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.)
All students have successfully either defended their thesis or passed their comprehensive exam in their first attempt. Thus, these results have not indicated a need for program improvement or change.
Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)
None planned for now.

Student Learning Outcome 3	
Student Learning Outcome	Demonstrate ability to apply communication concepts in organizational contexts
Measurement Instrument 1	DIRECT measure of student learning: For the thesis track, students complete an original research and successfully defend their thesis. A thesis typically focuses on answering a specialized question(s) in communication research. In their first semester of thesis work, students prepare a prospectus, which includes a rationale, literature review, methodology sections, and a timeline for thesis completion. When they successfully defend their prospectus, they then proceed with the rest of the research project to collect, analyze data, and then write up the findings and implications in their second semester of the thesis work. Completion of a thesis depends on student successfully applying communication concepts to the organizational context under investigation. For the non-thesis track, students must take the comprehensive exam for their degree completion. The exam is composed of three questions to assess each of the following sections: theoretical knowledge, methodological mastery, and application of theories and concepts to specific context. The design of the exam and the questions written by faculty take into account the learning outcomes.
Criteria for Student Success	In the case of the thesis track, student should successfully defend their thesis. In the case of the non-thesis track, the student must receive a "Pass" level or higher, specifically get 45 points or more when all committee member scores are combined for the Application area of their comprehensive exam. Their exam paper is evaluated by a set of rubrics adapted from the Widener University Doctor of Education Program (see attachment). The rubric for the theory/foundations answer assess for concept mastery, foundational content, literature use, organization, and language. Scores for each dimension per area range from "Insufficient" (1 point), "Emergent" (2 points), "Proficient" (3 points), and "Distinguished" (4 points). To successfully achieve this learning outcome, students must receive 13 out of a maximum of 20 points and no more than two individual dimension below "emergent" for each question area from each of their faculty committee member. For a score that is 18 or above, they are earmarked as "Pass with Honors." For the final step, scores from the committee members are combined by each question area, and then translated by a scale to determine success level. If the total combined score for each question area is less than 38, it is "Fail." If the combined score is 39-53 points, it gets "Pass." For scores that are 54 or above, with 60 points being maximum possible points, it gets "Pass with Honors."

Program Success Target for this Measurement	100%	**Percent of Program Achieving Target**	87%
Methods	Direct: Artifacts from capstone experience (N = 7) were used for this assessment. For student who have chosen the thesis track (n =1), three faculty who are members of the student's thesis committee reviewed their work and approved of its quality before the student was allowed to defend it orally. For students who chose the comprehensive exam (n = 6), three faculty members of their exam committee read and assessed the exam answers independently using the set of rubrics mentioned above. For this SLO, scores from the application section was used for this assessment.		
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.)

The thesis-track student successfully defended their thesis, and all of non-thesis track students except for one received a score of 45 or higher for each area of their comprehensive exam in their first attempt. There was one non-thesis track student who did get minimum score to pass this area of comprehensive exam, but fell short of 45 points for this assessment, this result does not indicate a need for program improvement or change. The student, who has been one of the strongest student in the program, was going through a very hectic period in life, and did not have enough time to prepare and study for the 6-hour long in-house exam.

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

None planned for now.

Comprehensive Exam Assessment Rubric

Scoring Rubric for Communication Foundations/Theory Question

Candidate Proficiencies	Insufficient 1	Emergent 2	Proficient 3	Distinguished 4
CONCEPT	Misunderstands prompt and/or confuses some significant concepts with regard to theory	Responds adequately to the prompt, may have some factual, interpretative or conceptual errors or irrelevancies with regard to theory.	Responds well to the prompt; analysis goes beyond the obvious and explores the uses and value of theory	Comprehensively responds to the prompt; analysis relevant, sophisticated and original; creates clear linkages between the centrality of theory to research
FOUNDATIONAL CONTENT	Explanation of theory/theories is inaccurate, vague, irrelevant or absent	Explanation of theory/theories is overly general and lacking depth	Explanation of theory/theories is clear, detailed, and accurate	Explanation of theory/theories is grounded, specific, arguable, and complex
LITERATURE	Evidence only narrative or anecdotal, awkwardly or incorrectly incorporated	Provides some evidence but not always relevant, sufficient, or integrated into the response; citations are minimal	Provides sufficient and appropriate evidence (literature in text of response) and makes effort to contextualize it; citations are appropriate	Provides substantial, well-chosen evidence (research and textual citations) establishing a clear foundation and framework; definitions are used to strengthen response; citations are excellent
ORGANIZATION	Arbitrary or no paragraph structure, illogical or no transition, repetitive, wanders	Uneven: paragraphs sometimes effective, but some brief, weakly unified, or undeveloped; some awkward or missing transitions	Distinct units of thought in paragraphs, coherently arranged; some transitions between sentences and paragraphs	Apt, seemingly inevitable sequence of paragraphs; appropriate, clear and adequate transitions between sentences and paragraphs
LANGUAGE	Frequent major and minor grammar problems; frequent imprecise diction; wordiness; awkward syntax; repetitive sentence patterns; problems impede meaning	Occasional major grammar errors (e.g., agreement, tense); frequent minor grammar errors (e.g., prepositions, articles); awkward syntax; wordiness	Some mechanical difficulties; occasional problematic word choices or awkward syntax errors; occasional grammar errors; some wordiness	Scholarly and precise writing, syntactic variety, clear command of the language

*Assessment form and rubrics adapted from Widener University's Doctor of Education Program

Scoring Rubric for Communication Research Methods Question

Candidate Proficiencies	Insufficient 1	Emergent 2	Proficient 3	Distinguished 4
Links Between Research Problem and Design	Provided no evidence to for a rationale of one's choice of research designs	Provided limited evidence of a rationale for one's choice of research designs	Made logical connections between one's chosen research designs and the research problem	Described how specific elements of research designs provide a unique justification for solving a research question
Research Design Links between Sampling Strategy and Research Design	Included no information to justify the sampling strategy	Included limited information to justify the sampling strategy	Included information to justify the sampling strategy	Described how the chosen sampling strategy strengthens decisions about one's choices of research designs
Methods, Measurement, & Procedures	Provided no rationale for the selection/creation of quantitative or qualitative protocols that emphasize validity, reliability, credibility and/or trustworthiness	Provided limited rationale for selection/creation of quantitative or qualitative protocols that emphasize validity, reliability, credibility and/or trustworthiness	Provided clear rationale for selection/creation of quantitative or qualitative protocols that emphasize validity, reliability, credibility and/or trustworthiness	Provided very strong rationale for selection/creation of quantitative or qualitative protocols that emphasize validity, reliability, credibility and/or trustworthiness
Data Analysis	Showed no understanding of appropriate use of the selected method	Showed limited understanding of appropriate use of the selected method	Showed understanding of appropriate use of the selected method	Showed advanced understanding of appropriate use of the selected method
Quality of Writing	Response is mechanically and rhetorically flawed	Response made some mechanical and rhetorical errors	Response is relatively free of mechanical and rhetorical errors	Response is well-written and has a strong rhetorical structure

Scoring Rubric for Communication Application Question

Candidate Proficiencies	Insufficient 1	Emergent 2	Proficient 3	Distinguished 4
CONCEPT	Misunderstands prompt and/or confuses some significant concepts of the case example	Responds adequately to the prompt, may have some factual, interpretive, or conceptual errors or irrelevancies	Responds well to the prompt analysis goes beyond the obvious	Responds comprehensively to the prompt; analysis relevant, sophisticated, and original
APPLICATION TO PROBLEM /CASE	Fails to demonstrate minimal proficiencies to describe, explain, or resolve the case or situation as presented; provides limited evidence of critical thinking and problem-solving	Demonstrates minimal proficiencies to describe, explain, or resolve the case or situation as presented; demonstrates cursory critical thinking and problem-solving	Demonstrates acceptable proficiencies to describe, predict, or resolve the case or situation as presented; demonstrates critical thinking and problem-solving	Demonstrates excellence and proficiency in describing, predicting, or resolving the case or situation as presented; integrates scholarship in a way that demonstrates excellent critical thinking and problem-solving
LITERATURE	Evidence only narrative or anecdotal, awkwardly or incorrectly incorporated	Provides some evidence but not always relevant, sufficient, or integrated into the response; citations are minimal	Provides sufficient and appropriate evidence (literature in text of response) and makes effort to contextualize it; citations are appropriate	Provides substantial, well-chosen evidence (research or textual citations) establishing a clear foundation and framework; definitions are used to strengthen response; citations are excellent
ORGANIZATION	Arbitrary or no paragraph structure, illogical or no transitions, repetitive, wanders	Uneven: paragraphs sometimes effective, but some brief, weakly unified, or undeveloped; some awkward or missing transitions	Distinct units of thought in paragraphs, coherently arranged; some transitions between sentences and paragraphs	Apt, seemingly inevitable sequence of paragraphs; appropriate, clear, and adequate transitions between sentences and paragraphs
LANGUAGE	Frequent major and minor grammar problems; frequent imprecise diction; wordiness; awkward syntax; repetitive sentence patterns; problems impede meaning	Occasional major grammar errors (e.g., agreement, tense); frequent minor grammar errors (e.g., prepositions, articles); occasional imprecise diction; awkward syntax; wordiness	Some mechanical difficulties; occasional problematic word choices or awkward syntax errors; occasional grammar errors; some wordiness	Scholarly and precise use of language, clear command of the language