

**Assurance of Student Learning  
2019-2020**

Potter College

Communication

0471 Communicating in Organizational Certificate

Dr. Jieyoung Kong

*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:** Analyzes and diagnoses communication challenges in the business world.

**Instrument 1** Direct: Analysis of a course assignment paper.

**Instrument 2**

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.

**Met**

**Not Met**

**Student Learning Outcome 2:** Applies organizational communication theories and principles to develop messages and solutions that address challenges inherent to organizing.

**Instrument 1** Direct: Analysis of a course assignment paper.

**Instrument 2**

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.

**Met**

**Not Met**

**Student Learning Outcome 3:** Formulates practical recommendations supported by academic knowledge.

**Instrument 1** Direct: Analysis of a course assignment paper.

**Instrument 2**

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.

The result from this assessment indicate that the mean scores of the sampled student papers fell short of the self-reported goals for this year's assessment. The assessment process and condition were not ideal. First, the SLOs used for this year's assessment have not been fully adopted by key courses in the program. Over this past summer, the program coordinator drafted a tentative set of student learning objectives based on input and feedback from those faculty who teach courses in the program. This semester, the aim is to get them approved by the Graduate Program Committee followed by the Graduate Faculty Committee for adoption at the department level. Second, the course that was chosen for the assessment was selected because it had a larger number of students enrolled in the certificate program at one time, even though the focus of the course was less on organizational communication and more on strategies of communication. In short, the assessment results for this year is effective in so far as the assessment process, but their validity still needs to be improved by taking further steps.

The following recommendations came out of this year's assessment.

- Finalize and adopt learning outcomes for the program.

- Examine learning outcomes of courses and program outcomes to improve their alignment.
- 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.
  - Review program mission and outcomes.
  - Ensure program outcomes are met through the courses.

## Student Learning Outcome 1

<b>Student Learning Outcome</b>	<b>Analyzes and diagnoses communication challenges in the business world.</b>		
<b>Measurement Instrument 1</b>	DIRECT measure of student learning: Student artifact chosen for SLO assessment was a 3-4 page paper assignment where they had to assume the role of a communication professional tasked to analyse what went wrong with a real-life communication event and then propose a strategy to help the client become a more competent communicator.		
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	Due to the fact that there is no capstone course or core courses for this certificate, the course with the largest number of students enrolled in the certificate program was selected. Scores on the rubric item for this SLO ranged from “insufficient (1 point),” “weak (2 point),” “proficient (3 points),” and “excellent (4 points).” Success is defined as proficient (3) or higher.		
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	66%	<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	66%
<b>Methods</b>	Direct: Artifact from the course were collected from 3 students (n = 3) in the course and all identifiers were removed (e.g. student name, course name, and faculty name). Two full-time graduate faculty were assigned to evaluate each paper, so 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.		
<b>Based on your results, highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.</b>		<b>Met</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
<b>Actions</b> (Describe the decision-making process and actions for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)			
<p>The Graduate Program Coordinator drafted a tentative set of learning outcomes for the certificate program over the summer of 2020. The program learning outcomes has yet to be reviewed and approved by the Graduate Program Committee and then by the Graduate Faculty Committee at the department level, but the program coordinator decided to go ahead and use the tentative learning outcomes for this year’s assessment. The result for this particular SLO indicate that the mean scores for all of the sampled student papers met the self-declared assessment goal, suggesting there is good alignment between the assignment learning outcome and the program learning outcome.</p> <p>The sample size for this year’s assessment was small compared to the total number of enrolled students (N = 11) in our certificate program. The reason is because there is no designated core courses for this program and no one course has all of the enrolled students at one time. Of the three courses taught in 2019-2020 for this program, the course with the greatest number of enrolled students was selected for the assessment. Since the program learning objectives have yet to be formally adopted by the faculty who teach the courses in the program, it was not possible to ask those instructors to provide artifacts of those students enrolled in the program for assessment purposes.</p>			
<b>Follow-Up</b> (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)			
Once the program learning objectives are approved for adoption by the end of fall 2020, they will be communicated to faculty members who teach the relevant courses in the program so that the course learning objectives and the program learning outcomes can be aligned before the start of 2021-22. This is necessary not only for the assessment to achieve greater validity and reliability, but also to be able to gather artifacts from all those students enrolled in the program scattered across different courses with the expectations that program learning objectives will be embedded in student work even if their specific course assignments may differ.			
<b>Next Assessment Cycle Plan</b> (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome)			
After consulting the Graduate Program Committee and course instructors, program will be assessed using the same process.			

## Student Learning Outcome 2

<b>Student Learning Outcome</b>	<b>Applies organizational communication theories and principles to develop messages and solutions that address challenges inherent to organizing.</b>		
<b>Measurement Instrument 1</b>	DIRECT measure of student learning: Student artifact chosen for SLO assessment was a 3-4 page paper assignment where they had to assume the role of a communication professional tasked to analyse what went wrong with a real-life communication event and then propose a strategy to help the client become a more competent communicator.		
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	Due to the fact that there is no capstone course or core courses for this certificate, the course with the largest number of students enrolled in the certificate program was selected. Two thirds 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).” Success is defined as proficient (3) or higher.		
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	66%	<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	0%
<b>Methods</b>	Direct: Artifact from the course were collected from 3 students (n = 3) in the course and all identifiers were removed (e.g. student name, course name, and faculty name). Two full-time graduate faculty were assigned to evaluate each paper, so 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.		
<b>Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.</b>		<b>Met</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
<b>Actions</b> (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)			
<p>The Graduate Program Coordinator drafted a tentative set of learning outcomes for the certificate program over the summer of 2020. The program learning outcomes has yet to be reviewed and approved by the Graduate Program Committee and then by the Graduate Faculty Committee at the department level, but the program coordinator decided to go ahead and use the tentative learning outcomes for this year’s assessment, instead of using the course learning objectives. The average score for this particular SLO was 2.15 points, or “weak,” suggesting the assignment learning objective and this particular learning outcome did not align.</p> <p>The sample size for this year’s assessment was small compared to the total number of enrolled students (N = 11) in our certificate program. The reason is because there is no designated core courses for this program and no one course has all of the enrolled students at one time. Of the three courses taught in 2019-2020 for this program, the course with the greatest number of enrolled students was selected for the assessment. Since the program learning objectives have yet to be formally adopted by the faculty who teach the courses in the program, it was not possible to ask those instructors to provide artifacts of those students enrolled in the program for assessment purposes.</p>			
<b>Follow-Up</b> (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)			
Once the program learning objectives are approved for adoption by the end of fall 2020, they will be communicated to faculty members who teach the relevant courses in the program so that the course learning objectives and the program learning outcomes can be aligned before the start of 2021-22. This is necessary not only for the assessment to achieve greater validity and reliability, but also to be able to gather artifacts from all those students enrolled in the program scattered across different courses with the expectations that program learning objectives will be embedded in student work even if their specific course assignments may differ.			
<b>Next Assessment Cycle Plan</b> (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome)			
After consulting the Graduate Program Committee and course instructors, program will be assessed using the same process.			

### Student Learning Outcome 3

<b>Student Learning Outcome</b>	<b>Formulates practical recommendations supported by academic knowledge.</b>		
<b>Measurement Instrument 1</b>	DIRECT measure of student learning: Student artifact chosen for SLO assessment was a 3-4 page paper assignment where they had to assume the role of a communication professional tasked to analyse what went wrong with a real-life communication event and then propose a strategy to help the client become a more competent communicator.		
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	Due to the fact that there is no capstone course or core courses for this certificate, the course with the largest number of students enrolled in the certificate program was selected. Two thirds 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).” Success is defined as proficient (3) or higher.		
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	66%	<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	0%
<b>Methods</b>	Direct: Artifact from the course were collected from 3 students (n = 3) in the course and all identifiers were removed (e.g. student name, course name, and faculty name). Two full-time graduate faculty were assigned to evaluate each paper, so each paper was read twice by two different revieweres. 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.		
<b>Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.</b>		<b>Met</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
<b>Actions</b> (Describe the decision-making process and actions for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)			
<p>The Graduate Program Coordinator drafted a tentative set of learning outcomes for the certificate program over the summer of 2020. The program learning outcomes has yet to be reviewed and approved by the Graduate Program Committee and then by the Gradaute Faculty Committee at the department level, but the program coordinator decided to go ahead and use the tentative learning outcomes for this year’s assessment, instead of using the course learning objectives. The average score for this particular SLO was 2.15 points, or “weak,” suggesting the assignment learning objective and this particular learning outcome did not align.</p> <p>The sample size for this year’s assessment was small compared to the total number of enrolled students (N = 11) in our certificate program. The reason is because there is no designated core courses for this program and no one course has all of the enrolled students at one time. Of the three courses taught in 2019-2020 for this program, the course with the greatest number of enrolled students was selected for the assessment. Since the program learning objectives have yet to be formally adopted by the faculty who teach the courses in the program, it was not possible to ask those instructors to provide artifacts of those students enrolled in the program for assessment purposes.</p>			
<b>Follow-Up</b> (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)			
Once the program learning objectives are approved for adoption bye the end of fall 2020, they will be communicated to faculty members who teach the relevant courses in the program so that the course learning objectives and the program learning outcomes can be aligned before the start of 2021-22. This is necessary not only for the assessment to achieve greater validity and reliability, but also to be able to gather artifacts from all those students enrolled in the program scattered across different courses with the expectations that proram learning objectives will be embedded in student work even if their specific course assignments may differ.			
<b>Next Assessment Cycle Plan</b> (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome)			
After consulting the Graduate Program Committee and course instructors, program will be assessed using the same process.			

Student Artifact File Identifier: \_\_\_\_\_

## Certificate in Communicating in Organizations

### CCO.SLO.1. - Analyzes and diagnoses communication challenges in the business world.

<i>Regarding the paper, please assess how the author effectively analyzes and diagnoses communication challenges in the business world.</i>	
	<b>EXCELLENT</b> - Demonstrates excellence and proficiency in analyzing and diagnosing communication challenges in the business world.
	<b>PROFICIENT</b> - Demonstrates acceptable proficiency in analyzing and diagnosing communication challenges in the business world.
	<b>WEAK</b> - Demonstrates minimal proficiency in analyzing and diagnosing communication challenges in the business world.
	<b>INSUFFICIENT</b> - Fails to demonstrate minimal proficiency in analyzing and diagnosing communication challenges in the business world.

### CCO.SLO.2. - Applies organizational communication theories and principles to develop messages and solutions that address challenges inherent to organizing.

<i>Regarding the paper, please assess how well the author applies organizational communication theories and principles to develop messages and solutions that address challenges inherent to organizing.</i>	
	<b>EXCELLENT</b> - Very effective in applying organizational communication theories and principles with a good fit to develop appropriate messages and solutions that address challenges inherent to organizing.
	<b>PROFICIENT</b> – Adequately applies organizational communication theories and principles to develop clear messages and solutions that address challenges inherent to organizing.
	<b>WEAK</b> – Minimally or poorly applies organizational communication theories and principles to develop messages and solutions that address challenges inherent to organizing.
	<b>INSUFFICIENT</b> - Fails to apply organizational communication theories and principles, failed to develop messages and solutions that address challenges inherent to organizing.

**CCO.SLO.3. - Formulates practical recommendations supported by academic knowledge.**

<i>Regarding the paper, please assess how effectively the author formulates practical recommendations supported by academic knowledge.</i>	
	<b>EXCELLENT</b> – Effectively integrates academic knowledge in a way that demonstrates critical thinking to formulate practical recommendations for the said communication problem.
	<b>PROFICIENT</b> – Integrates academic knowledge in a way that demonstrates critical thinking to formulate practical recommendations for the said communication problem.
	<b>WEAK</b> - Minimally integrates academic knowledge in a way that demonstrates critical thinking to formulate practical recommendations for the said communication problem.
	<b>INSUFFICIENT</b> - Fails to integrate academic knowledge in a way that demonstrates critical thinking to formulate practical recommendations for the said communication problem.

**Optional - If you have additional comments or remarks about the work:** \_\_\_\_\_