

Program Assessment: *Annual Report*

Program(s): Strategic Communications Minor/Certificate

Department: N/A

College/School: School for Professional Studies

Date: 4-15-2019

Primary Assessment Contact: Katie Devany

1. Which program student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

The following LO was assessed:

LO #5: Make oral presentations suitable for academic and professional audiences.

While this LO is scheduled to be assessed during AY 19-20 declining longitudinal data related to student preparedness and overall experience necessitated the need to expedite review to this academic year.

2. What data/artifacts of student learning were collected for each assessed outcome? Were Madrid student artifacts included?

In reviewing summative data from student evaluations, it became clear that the current learning tool designed to record and assess student oral presentations was not serving as an adequate assessment of the intended artifact (student speeches) causing confusion and reducing the overall quality of student work. Furthermore, data related to the communication of course learning outcomes, overall course design, and application of course content were also reviewed as this affected the ability to achieve the stated LO.

Madrid student artifacts were not included.

3. How did you analyze the assessment data? What was the process? Who was involved?

NOTE: If you used rubrics as part of your analysis, please include them in an appendix.

Quantitative and qualitative data was collected using BLUE student course evaluations as well as qualitative information derived from the instructor of record for CMMK 1210, the course in which assessment of the LO is most apparent due to the derived artifact. Data was compiled, averaged and compared across three years by the program director.

4. What did you learn from the data? Summarize the major findings of your analysis for each assessed outcome.

NOTE: If necessary, include any tables, charts, or graphs in an appendix.

This was the first year that one instructor taught all four sections of CMMK 1210. Consistency was applied to each section as well as introduction of an improved online tool to record and assess student artifacts (speeches). Additionally, data confirms that this revision has improved course content application and achievement of the learning outcomes (see appendix).

5. How did your analysis inform meaningful change? How did you *use the analyzed data to make or implement recommendations for change* in pedagogy, curriculum design, or your assessment plan?

The analysis has prompted the creation of a master course for CMMK 1210 in which the current instructor will assume the role of the master course designer responsible for developing the course artifact and additional formative assessment which will be implemented by any instructor who teaches the course. In this way, it is planned that continued assessment of LO #5 is needed for next AY to monitor progress.

6. Did you follow up (“close the loop”) on past assessment work? If so, what did you learn? (*For example, has that curriculum change you made two years ago manifested in improved student learning today, as evidenced in your recent assessment data and analysis?*)

We will address this question once we have collected one year's worth of assessment related data.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any revised/updated assessment plans to the University Assessment Coordinator along with this report.

Appendix

