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|  |
| --- |
| ***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: Critically analyze and evaluate organizational messages considering contextual factors, message qualities and attributes** |
| **Instrument 1** | **Direct: Comparative Leaders Assignment from COMM 330: Leadership Communication** |
| **Instrument 2** |  |
| **Instrument 3** |  |
| **Based on your results, check whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | **[ ]  Met** | **[x]  Not Met** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2: 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 Student Learning Outcome 2.** | **[x]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Program Summary (Briefly summarize the action and follow up items from your detailed responses on subsequent pages.)**  |
| This was the first time assessing the new certificate which at the time of assessment had approximately 15 students enrolled. Certificate students enrolled in COMM 349 (*n* = 6) and COMM 330 (*n* = 5) from the fall and spring were assessed, but the sample size was small. Rubrics were developed for assessing projects from both classes. Due to shifting courses to online formats during the pandemic, the original artifact identified for assessment in COMM 330 was revised, and therefore, the chosen assignment may not have been fully reflective of SLO1. Nevertheless, based on the 2020-2021 assessment, the following measures were implemented to enhance student achievement and increase reliability and validity of the assessment measures. First, the student learning outcomes for the certificate were revised to better capture the program goals, and a new assessment plan was created identifying potential artifacts from different courses for evaluation. These artifacts can be rotated in order to provide different perspectives on the achievement of objectives. In addition to the evaluation of course projects, pre-post test assessments will be implemented. The revised objectives are as follows:**SLO1:** Evaluate the importance of communication in developing strong working relationships in organizations via active listening, adaptability, conflict management, and teamwork. **SLO2**: Explain cultural differences, and adapt one’s communication to culturally diverse audiences**SLO3**: Demonstrate the steps of the problem solving process with emphasis on team building behaviors Based on the 2020-2021 assessment results the following adjustments were made: For COMM 330: 1) Instructions for the assignment were clarified to include the use of scholarly sources from the Communication discipline, 2) Students were provided a list of potential Leadership theories to apply within their analysis, 3) A sample student paper was provided to students as an exemplar of proficiency in analyzing and evaluating leader messages, and 4) Other course projects were identified as providing more valid measurement of the student learning objectives. Moving forward, the Leadership Analysis Paper will be a potential artifact for assessing SLO1 and a new assessment rubric will be created.For COMM 349: Instructors added language to the project description encouraging students to provide more depth in proposing realistic implementation plans for their solutions and to focus the language of their projects to be more strategically persuasive based on their audience. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 1** |
| **Student Learning Outcome**  | **Evaluate organizational messages considering contextual factors, message qualities and attributes** |
| **Measurement Instrument 1**  | **Direct: Comparative Leaders Assignment from COMM 330: Leadership Communication**In this paper assignment, students critically analyze and compare messages of two leaders using leadership theories and concepts. Students evaluate and critique the leaders’ messages both verbal and nonverbal, and provide an evaluation of contextual appropriateness. We evaluated the first learning outcome based on two criteria a) how well the student analyzed the leaders’ messages using relevant leadership communication theories, concepts, and scholarly sources and b) how well the student evaluated and critiqued the leader’s messages with regard for context, message content, and verbal/nonverbal qualities. We assessed the outcome using a 4-point scale (1 as Insufficient to 4 as Excellent—see attached rubric).  |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Students should reach or exceed 3 (Proficient) in the above criteria. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | 50% and above | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 0% |
| **Methods**  | The Communication faculty assessed all Leader Comparison papers from the **five** certificate students enrolled in COMM 330: Leadership Communication for the Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 semesters. COMM 330 is a required course for the certificate which students are likely to complete later in the program. After the student’s name was deleted from each paper, 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 the program). Reviewers submitted the evaluations electronically. Each paper was reviewed by both raters. Mean scores were computed for each rubric category aimed at capturing the full SLO. The overall average score for this SLO was 2.40, and none of the five students reached or exceeded a 3 (proficient). Raters evaluated the papers on how well students analyzed messages using communication theories, concepts and support (*m* = 2.20) and on how well the students evaluated and critiqued leader messages with regard to contextual appropriateness, message content, and verbal/nonverbal qualities (*m* = 2.60). Raters also provided qualitative feedback on their overall perceptions of the papers commenting that students needed to apply more communication leadership theories to their analysis and provide more nuance to leader messages based on context. |
| **Based on your results, highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | **[ ]  Met** | **[x]  Not Met** |
| **Actions**  |
| Given that only 5 student papers were assessed for this new certificate, ratings should not be seen as a valid measure of the course/certificate effectiveness. That said, the following actions were taken to increase student achievement in the Fall 2021 semester: 1) Instructions for the assignment were clarified to include the use of scholarly sources from the Communication discipline, 2) Students were provided a list of potential Leadership theories to apply within their analysis 3) A sample student paper was provided to students as an exemplar of proficiency in analyzing and evaluating leader messages, and 4) Other course projects were identified as providing more valid measurement of the student learning objectives (Summer 2021). |
| **Follow-Up**  |
| The Assessment Plan for the Certificate in Workplace Communication was revised in an effort to more accurately capture achievement of the student learning objectives and a new assessment plan was created identifying potential artifacts from different courses for evaluation (Summer 2021). These artifacts can be rotated in order to provide different perspectives on the achievement of objectives. From COMM 330: Leadership Communication, the Leader Analysis Paper was identified as a better artifact for measuring the revised objective on developing strong working relationships. In addition to the evaluation of course projects, pre-post test assessments will be implemented that are specifically related to Interpersonal Communication Competence and Intercultural Sensitivity (Fall 2021 and Spring 2022).  |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan**  |
| The revised SLO will be evaluated again in the 2021-2022 academic year. Data will be collected from Certificate students enrolled in the Fall and Spring semesters. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2** |
| **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 model of problem solving (PMOPS) by completing each of the following steps: 1. analyze 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 using a 4-point scale (1 as Beginner to 4 as Exemplary—see attached rubric).  |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Students should exceed 3 (Accomplished) in the above criteria. |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | 70% and above | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | 100% |
| **Methods**  | The Communication faculty assessed all Group Decision Making Projects from the six certificate students enrolled in COMM 349: Small Group Communication for the Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 semesters. After student names were deleted from each paper, 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 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 3.44 with 100% of students exceeding 3 (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* = 3.63), Problem Identification (*m* = 3.67), Criteria for Evaluating Solutions (*m* = 3.33), Evaluation of Alternatives (*m* = 3.33), Recommended Solutions (*m* = 3.5), and Implementation Plan (*m* = 3.17). Raters also provided qualitative comments on the student projects citing strengths in defining and researching problems and proposing solutions. Raters recommended students focus on communication research in proposing specific solutions and develop proposals that are written in a more persuasive style based on their audiences. |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | **Direct: Peer Assessments from COMM 349: Small Group Communication**In order to measure students’ level of team building behaviors and conflict management, students’ team members completed a peer-review on their overall group performance. Team members rated each student on the following items: problem-solving, team building, and conflict management using a percentage grade scale.  |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Students should exceed an 80% (B)  |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | 80% and Above | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | **100%** |
| **Methods** | At the end of the course students were asked to complete a peer evaluation of each member of their group measuring their groupmates’ level of participation, team building behaviors, and conflict management. The COMM 349 instructor submitted average scores for each student on each dimension (problem solving *m* = .88; team building *m* = .86; conflict management *m* = .91). |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | **[x]  Met** | **[ ]  Not Met** |
| **Actions** |
| Students demonstrated proficiency in problem solving and team work. The lowest mean score regarding the problem solving process was for the Implementation Plan (*m* = 3.17). Raters also recommended students develop proposals that are written in a more persuasive style based on their audiences. Therefore, instructors of the course in the 2021-2022 academic year will emphasize in the project guidelines that students provide more depth in proposing realistic implementation plans for their solutions and to focus the language of their projects to be more strategically persuasive based on their audience.  |
| **Follow-Up**  |
| This SLO will remain the same for the next assessment cycle. Progress toward improving solution implementation and persuasive language will be a focal point for improvements in the 2021-2022 academic year. |
| **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** |
| This student learning outcomes will be assessed again in the 2021-2022 academic year. Data will be collected from Certificate students in the Fall and Spring semester. |

**Workplace Communication Certificate Assessment**

**Rubric for Evaluating the Comparative Leadership Report (COMM 330)**

**SLO1 -** Critically analyze and evaluate organizational messages considering contextual factors, message qualities and attributes.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. *Please assess how the author* ***analyzes*** messages from their selected leaders.  *Consider the degree to which the student incorporates relevant leadership communication theories, concepts, and outside support.*
 |
|  | **EXCELLENT** - Demonstrates excellence and proficiency in analyzing leader messages, provides in depth application of leadership trait/style theories, and cites scholarly sources.  |
|  | **PROFICIENT** - Demonstrates acceptable proficiency in analyzing leader messages. Discusses leadership theory and concepts and has some support, but should focus on more scholarly sources.  |
|  | **WEAK** - Demonstrates minimal proficiency in analyzing leader communication. Minimally discusses leader theories and concepts and has limited sources.  |
|  | **INSUFFICIENT** - Fails to demonstrate minimal proficiency in analyzing leader messages. Does not apply leader theories/concepts and fails to cite appropriate sources.  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. *Please assess how well the author evaluates and critiques the leaders’ messages with regard to contextual appropriateness, message content, and verbal and nonverbal qualities.*
 |
|  | **EXCELLENT** - Very effective in critiquing the effectiveness of leader messages with a nuanced discussion of the context for the messages, evaluation of content and style, and success of the message strategies.  |
|  | **PROFICIENT** – Adequately critiques the effectiveness of leader messages including discussion of the context for the messages, evaluation of content and style, and success of the message strategies.  |
|  | **WEAK** – Minimally or poorly critiques the effectiveness of leader messages. Vaguely references the context/situation of the messages, provides cursory evaluation of content, style, and message effectiveness.  |
|  | **INSUFFICIENT** - Fails to adequately critique the effectiveness of leader messages, does not discuss the context of the messages, and vaguely discusses style and content without support or observation of the leaders’ success.  |

**GROUP DECISION MAKING PROJECT RUBRIC**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Component | Exemplary -- 4 | Accomplished -- 3 | Developing -- 2 | Beginner -- 1 |
| 1. Problem Description and Analysis
 | Provides appropriate background information of the problem, identifying an important issue to address. Demonstrated understanding of the problem, related issues, what is desired, and what obstacles might exist.  | Provides appropriate background information of and identified an important issue to address, but did not connect related issues in the context. Addresses some obstacles. | Needs to add more description of the context/background information. Does not show nuance in the details of the problem and needed to add depth to the discussion of obstacles. | Provides little information regarding the background of the problem or context. Shows little nuance of the context and does not discuss obstacles. |
| 1. Identification of Possible Solutions
 | Presents a comprehensive list of the most relevant possible options and describes each in detail. | Identifies options that represent several of the most relevant possible alternatives. | Identifies some options that are relevant and others that are not. OR only names one option. | Selects options that are clearly not relevant to the decision. |
| 1. Criteria for Evaluating Options
 | Clearly identifies the criteria by which the identified options will be assessed.The criteria reflect an unusually thorough understanding of the nature of the decision task. | Clearly identifies the criteria by which the identified options will be assessed.With no significant exceptions, the criteria are relevant to the decision task. | Identifies some relevant criteria by which the identified options will be assessed. However, some relevant criteria are omitted, or criteria are included that may not be relevant to the task. | Identifies few or no criteria that are relevant to the decision task. |
| 1. Assessment of Options

Evaluation of Alternatives | Provides a thorough, fully developed assessment of each option based upon the criteria. Exceeds the demand of the decision task by comparing and contrasting the options toprovide greater insights. | Presents an accurate assessment of the extent to which the options meet the identified criteria. | Does not completely address all the criteria; or applies all appropriate criteria to the options but is not completely accurate in assessing how well the criteria have been met. | Does not address the extent to which the options meet the criteria or is inaccurate in assessing how well the alternatives meet the criteria. |
| 1. Recommended Solution/ Rationale for Choice
 | Selects an option that meets or exceeds the criteria and represents a well-supported answer to the initial decision question. Provides a useful discussion of issues and insights that arose during the selection process. | Successfully answers the decision question by selecting an option that meets or exceeds established criteria and justifies their answer by referencing how the decision was made. | Selects an option that does not entirely conform to the student’s assessment of the options. | Makes a selection that does not appear reasonable or cannot be justified by the student’s evaluation of the options. |
| 1. Implementation Plan
 | Provided specific, clear, and reasonable steps for implementing the proposed solution. | Provided somewhat clear steps for implementing the proposed solution, but may lack some depth or propose less reasonable actions.  | Provided an implementation plan lacking in detail and possibly not reasonable. | Lacked specific details for implementing the solution and/or provided an unreasonable plan. |

Adapted from the Catalina Foothills School District’s 21st Century Skills Rubric: Critical and Creative Thinking: Decision Making 6/06 – 6/11. Created in Collaboration with the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity (SCALE).