**2013-2014 CLASS FACT Assessment Year End Report, May 30, 2014**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Name(s)** | **FACT Faculty Fellow** | **Department Chair** |
| **COMMUNICATION** | **DR. TERRY L. WEST** | **DR. GALE YOUNG** |

[NOTE: Items A, B, C, and D are identical to your Page 2 on your Annual Report for CAPR. Please simply cut and paste from there. Item E is unique to the CLASS FACT Project.]

**A. Program Student Learning Outcomes**

|  |
| --- |
| **1.** Create, analyze, edit, and respond to written, spoken, and visual messages in multiple formats and contexts.2. Research and evaluate effective communication including design and production techniques using quantitative, qualitative, and critical inquiry.3. Effectively communicate as leaders and participants in collaborative and individual contexts involving divergent ideas, conflicts, and relationships across cultural and gender differences.4. Explain and illustrate the construction and maintenance of shared communities that influence and are influenced by communication using critical, cultural, racial, socio-political, gender and justice perspectives.5. Explain and illustrate concepts of ethical and democratic leadership applying major communication perspectives including rhetorical and discursive processes, purposes, and relevant media.6. Explain and illustrate the role identity plays in communication within global and local contexts and in negotiating paradoxes of participation. |

**B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed**

|  |
| --- |
| **1.** Create, analyze, edit, and respond to written, spoken, and visual messages in multiple formats and contexts. |

**C. Summary of Assessment Process**

|  |
| --- |
| In 2013-2014, the Department of Communication entered Year 2 of its 5-year assessment program for the undergraduate curriculum. The **Student Learning Outcome** assessed this year was **#1: Create, analyze, edit, and respond to written, spoken, and visual messages in multiple formats and contexts**. According to the Department’s current curriculum map, 3 courses are used to assess the SLO: COMM 2200 (Introduction to Journalistic Writing—written messages); COMM 2320 (Communication Writing and Design—written and visual messages); and COMM 3560 (Persuasion Theory and Practics—spoken and written messages). Results are summarized below. Dr. Terry L. West, departmental assessment coordinator, again served as a member of the CLASS Faculty Assessment Coordinator Team (FACT). In addition to this undergraduate SLO assessment, Dr. West has developed the following:* A grid aligning Department SLOs with CSUEB Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs).
* A Five-year Assessment Plan for the Master of Arts in Communication degree.
* Pilot assessment (in progress SP 14) for MA SLO #2: Develop a program of original research adding to the discovery of knowledge, theory, and practical applications toward issues in the communication discipline. This pilot study will be used to confer with Department faculty toward development of a full assessment program beginning in 2014-2015.

The alignment grid and MA assessment plan, along with undergraduate counterparts, are posted on the CLASS website at <http://www20.csueastbay.edu/class/assessment/index.html> . |

**D. Summary of Assessment Results**

|  |
| --- |
| Undergraduate SLO #1 Assessment Data: Data were collected separately in Fall 2013 for COMM 3560 (n=34, 1 spoken and 1 major written assignment); Winter 2014 for COMM 2200 (n=21, composite of 6 written assignments); and Winter 2014 for COMM 2320 (n=22; major writing assignment worth 55% of grade). Raw data for student achievement are as follows: Course Written Visual Spoken2200 Mean=82.5; >80=19/21 n/a n/a 2320 Mean=58; >75=7/22 Assessment incomplete\* n/a 3560 Mean=84; >80=27/34 n/a Mean=84.5; >85=25/34 \*Visual messages were not assessed due to confusion in departmental curriculum requirementsInterpreting the Data and “Closing the Loop”: \*Negative outliers skew means downward, but mastery of written skills in 2 of the 3 assessed samples  show most students achieving at the 80% level or above. The 3rd course (2320) assesses solely American Psychological Association Style Manual format, and may be atypical.\*Different written assignments are used for all 3 classes, providing non-uniform assessment\*Not all majors take 2200 or 3560, which are in different program options. This creates gaps in  assessing the SLO.\*”Visual” in 2320 is a group assignment with no individual assessment rubric; thus, 1/3 of the SLO is not assessed.\*None of the samples cover all of “create, analyze, edit, and respond”; some rubrics include “respond” options that are compliance/minimum rather than criterion-referenced at percentage levels.On May 23, 2014, the Department of Communication discussed assessment and “closing the loop” as part of its regular faculty meeting. The following points of discussion were presented and are continuing:\*The Department is changing to a new curriculum with a reduced core and three options. We  envision this process as an opportunity to coordinate the written part of this SLO in clearly mapped option courses with appropriate rubrics. Courses in the revised core will cover the  visual and spoken parts of the SLO. \* Lecturers (instructors for 2200 and 2320) are not trained in assessment, cannot be required to attend training meetings, and provide data that are difficult to use in assessment. There is an urgent need for a stronger hand regarding syllabus requirements, rubrics and mapping to SLOs and ILOs. The  Department is now aware of the problem and will undertake steps to improve the process. We  will also seek conversation with the CFA about processes for including lecturers more fully.\*The Departmental Assessment Coordinator suggests more time in faculty meetings for ongoing discussion of assessment and more thorough processes for “closing the loop.” Now that the  time-consuming task of curriculum change is near completion, this should be feasible.\*Under the most optimistic scenario for implementing the new curriculum, the current 5-year plan  should remain stable until a new one for the new curriculum is in place. Assessment for the M.A.  program may be revised, as the Department’s Graduate Coordinator has proposed a complete change in SLOs for the M.A. that will require departmental discussion and coordination. |

**E. Suggestions and Recommendations for the CLASS FACT Project in the Future**

|  |
| --- |
| Some of the same issues remain from last year, and may pertain to my own lack of expertise in using Microsoft Excel. I understand the purpose of the templates was to make it easier to report our data in a uniform and convenient way, but I personally struggled with some of it. I am not trained in Excel, would benefit from Excel training and would be happy to schedule individually with someone if it is not perceived as a need for the whole committee. I also think the mapping Excel template remains problematic because multiple indicators are difficult to enter in a meaningful way. In our department, we use quizzes, short essays, major papers, major examinations, creative projects, and presentations to assess various levels of our SLO’s. Rubrics created with the Word “table” function have worked better for me than Excel templates in mapping indicators to segments of the SLO’s. I also continue to have concerns about the push toward using Blackboard for assessment. I have yet to find a way demonstrated to use objective tests on Blackboard and control for cheating absent having all students take the test(s) at the same time in a lab with a computer for each student so the instructor can supervise against collaboration and ensure that the student taking the test is actually the student enrolled for the course. Blackboard rubrics I have seen for short assignments are much better, and I am enthusiastic about learning more in that area. Finally, I have concerns about the role of the Department Assessment Coordinator. I envision(ed) that role as one of “coordinating” a departmental assessment effort. For a variety of reasons, in our Department it has become a “Department Assessor” position. I will continue to work within our department on this issue; I do not see it as departmental unwillingness to undertake a full role in assessment. Rather, I believe issues with understaffing of our faculty and our response to our last CAPR call for curriculum revision have compressed our time resources. This should ease now that curriculum work has been completed. |

Thank you for your hard work for the past year, and have a Great Summer!