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

3. Effectively communicate as leaders and participants in collaborative and individual contexts involving divergent ideas, conflicts, and relationships across cultural and gender differences.

C. Summary of Assessment Process
In 2014-2015, the Department of Communication entered Year 3 of its 5-year assessment program for the undergraduate curriculum. The Student Learning Outcome assessed this year was #3: Effectively communicate as leaders and participants in collaborative and individual contexts involving divergent ideas, conflicts, and relationships across cultural and gender differences. According to the Department’s current curriculum map, courses used to assess the SLO are: COMM 2201 (Argumentation and Debate [Introductory Assessment]), COMM 3222 (Media Workshop: Editorial and Opinion Writing [Introductory and Practice Assessment]), and COMM 4885 and 4890 (Senior Project [Mastery Assessment]). Results are summarized below.

Dr. Terry L. West, departmental assessment coordinator, again served as a member of the CLASS Faculty Assessment Coordinator Team (FACT). Undergraduate and Graduate 5 Year Assessment plans, Curriculum Maps, Alignment with University Institutional Learning Outcomes, and year end reports are posted on the CLASS website at http://www20.csueastbay.edu/class/assessment/index.html.

D. Summary of Assessment Results

Undergraduate SLO #3 Assessment Data: Data were collected in WI 2015 for COMM 2201 (n=27), and COMM 3222 (n=12). Data for the COMM 4885 and 4890 Senior Project courses was not collected due to a lecturer’s failure to respond to repeated requests and another faculty member not collecting assessment data. The Department has not met to develop assessment rubrics for the SLO; assessment data consist of major assignments in the respective courses that the instructors believe most clearly assess the SLO. Raw data for student achievement are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Mean Proficiency</th>
<th>80%+ Proficiency</th>
<th>90%+ Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2201</td>
<td>In-Class Debate</td>
<td>83.11%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3222</td>
<td>Response to Op-Ed</td>
<td>86.67%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpreting the Data and “Closing the Loop”:

*If current assessment rubrics are accepted for the SLO, COMM students in the samples are largely successful at achieving the 80% proficiency level.
*Sample size is a likely explanation for why more students are achieving at 80-90% levels in the “Practice” assessment than in the “Introductory” assessment.
*Different written assignments are used for both classes, providing non-uniform assessment
*Not all majors take COMM 3222; equivalent practice assessment needs to cover all students.
*Failure to have data for Mastery assessment must be addressed in future curriculum decisions.
On May 20, 2015, the Department of Communication allotted five minutes for presentation of assessment data and “closing the loop” as part of its regular faculty meeting. The following points of discussion were presented and are continuing:

1. The department understands that insufficient time is being devoted to assessment and sees the upcoming semester conversion as an opportunity to undertake a new commitment to the process.
2. The department understands that assessment rubrics must be created for the current five-year plan until semester conversion occurs, and that the process must be departmental.
3. The department will engage further discussion as in fall 2015 about the assessment process and its implementation.

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

Working with the CLASS FACT has been one of the true highlights of my eight years at CSUEB. I think the people in this room have been dedicated to an important task in ensuring effective education of our students. The one biggest recommendation I have as I vacate our coordinator position for now is that the Dean’s Office seek ways to convince department chairs as needed that assessment is here to stay and must be taken seriously. It cannot be relegated to 2 to 5 minute discussions at occasional faculty meetings throughout the year, and cannot be assigned solely to the coordinator. It must be a true departmental effort. The issue I see is that the coordinator (unless s/he is the Department Chair) has little control over whether faculty participate in the process. I would leave that as my only suggestion; I think the FACT team is doing great work, often under difficult conditions.

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